

the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Charles P. Ziegenhals, to be postmaster at Bastrop, in the county of Bastrop and State of Texas, in the place of Durant H. Bell, whose commission expired February 13, 1899.

Henry J. Goddard, to be postmaster at Chippewa Falls, in the county of Chippewa and State of Wisconsin, in the place of G. B. McCall, whose commission expires April 23, 1900.

WITHDRAWALS.

Executive nominations withdrawn March 28, 1900.

Second Lieut. Alvin K. Baskette, to be first lieutenant, Thirty-seventh Regiment of Infantry.

Rufus Pryer, to be postmaster at Newman Grove, in the State of Nebraska.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, March 28, 1900.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PLACER MINING IN ALASKA.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 9294 be recommitted to the Committee on Public Lands. There is some misunderstanding as to its terms.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks that House bill 9294 be recommitted to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Let the title be reported.

Mr. LACEY. It is a bill to limit placer mining.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

House bill 9294, to limit placer mining claims in the district of Alaska, and for other purposes.

Mr. LACEY. The question was raised in the committee—

Mr. RICHARDSON. I want to ask the gentleman if we did not consider this bill the other day?

Mr. LACEY. No; this is a bill to limit the number of claims that may be taken up. It is not the bill that was up the other day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

REPRINT OF BILL.

Mr. LACEY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have a reprint of bill 9310. There has been one reprint already, which has been exhausted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for reprint of House bill 9310.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Let the title be reported, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 9310 extending in the district of Alaska the placer-mining laws to lands reserved from sale in sections 1 and 10 of an act of Congress approved May 14, 1898, entitled "An act extending the homestead laws and providing for right of way for railroads in the district of Alaska, and for other purposes."

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, there has already been one reprint, and that reprint has been exhausted. I ask for a reprint of the bill as it passed the House; and it would be well to enlarge the number of copies on account of the demand for this bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think we ought to have a reprint of the bill to the extent of 500 copies. The demand made upon me for the prospective mining laws of Alaska has been very great.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a reprint to the extent of 500 copies.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for a reprint of the bill of 500 copies. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDING SECTION 1176, REVISED STATUTES.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 911, to amend section 1176 of the Revised Statutes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1176 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same hereby is, amended so as to read as follows:

"Every soldier, sailor, and marine of the Union Army, Navy, or Marine Corps who is now, or may hereafter be, pensioned for rupture is entitled to receive, free of expense to such soldier, sailor, or marine, a single or double truss of such style as may be designated by the Surgeon-General of the United States Army as best suited to his disability."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. NORTON of Ohio, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SALES OF OTOE AND MISSOURIA LANDS.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3207) approving a revision and adjustment of certain sales of Otoe and Missouri lands in the States of Nebraska and Kansas.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say to the House that no time is it more important for the House to be in order than when unanimous consent is being asked for. The Chair asks members to cease conversation.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the revision and adjustment of the sales of lands in the late reservation of the confederated Otoe and Missouri tribes of Indians in the States of Nebraska and Kansas, to which more than three-fourths of the adult male members of said tribes have given their consent, by an instrument in writing dated the 20th day of November, 1899, and now on file in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, is hereby approved and confirmed, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to carry the same into full force and effect as to all delinquent purchasers of said lands, their heirs and legal representatives, in the following manner, to wit: The Secretary of the Interior shall cause notice to be given to said purchasers, their heirs and legal representatives, respectively, of the amounts of the deferred payments found to be due and unpaid on their respective purchases under the adjustment hereby confirmed; and within one year thereafter it shall be the duty of such purchasers, their heirs and representatives, respectively, to make full payment in cash of the amounts thus found to be due by them, severally, and in default of such payment within said period of one year the entry of any purchaser so in default shall be forthwith canceled and the lands shall be resold for the benefit of the Indians at not less than the appraised value thereof, and in no case at less than \$2.50 per acre, as provided in the act under which they were originally sold. Upon making such complete payment within the time so fixed each purchaser, his heirs or legal representatives, shall be entitled to receive a patent for the lands so purchased.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear some explanation.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. This bill, Mr. Speaker, is merely to approve a settlement which has been made between the settlers and the Indians. A controversy has been pending as to the price that should be paid for the lands for about sixteen years. At two or three different times Congress has passed an act approving the settlement, subject to approval by the tribes, but the tribes would never approve the settlements offered until lately.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, if this bill is to lead to debate, I shall object to it. I do not care to make the objection now.

The SPEAKER. The Chair again appeals to the House. The gentleman from Kansas has been sick and is not able to make himself heard, and it is an important matter for the House to understand.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Speaker, this is the second or third time that Congress has passed an act authorizing these settlers to make a settlement with the tribes as to the sale of these lands. These settlements have always been subject to the approval of the tribes, and the tribes have never given consent until this time. Now they have given assent by three-quarters of the adult members of the tribes. It is a controversy that has been pending for sixteen years. It is a settlement that has the approval of the Department, and all that the bill provides for is to authorize the Secretary to approve the settlement and carry it out. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FLYNN] is familiar with the controversy, and I desire to yield time to him.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, retaining the right to object, I want some arrangement made as to time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FLYNN].

Mr. FLYNN. In the first place, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that this bill does not involve any charge on the Treasury of the United States. The facts are that the Otoe and Missouri Indians in 1883 sold their reservation in the States of Nebraska and Kansas to certain settlers. The reservation had been appraised at \$356,887.07 and put up at auction. One of the worst scandals known to the history of the Land Department was inaugurated there. Almost everybody connected with the transaction, except the Commissioner of the General Land Office, was afterwards sent to the penitentiary. The settlers, although the appraisement was only \$256,887.07, bid the property up to \$516,851.52.

Afterwards, when they refused to pay the amount they had bid, they claimed that the Commissioner of the General Land Office was present and told them to bid whatever they liked and they would get the land at the appraised value. Accordingly their bids went up to twice the appraised value. As I have stated, when the time for settlement came, many of the settlers refused to pay what they had bid, claiming that the Department had told them they could get the land at the appraised value, no matter what they had bid. This matter has been pending since 1883. The Indians were sent to Oklahoma. They were unable to get all their money. The land has been exempt from taxes in Nebraska and Kansas since 1883. Some of this land, I understand, is now worth forty or fifty dollars an acre.

Some time ago Congress passed an act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to see whether a compromise could be made

between some three hundred and odd settlers and the Indians. The Secretary at various times undertook to make a compromise, but was unsuccessful. Last November a compromise agreement was entered into between the representatives of the settlers and the Indians. This bill proposes to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to approve that agreement, whereby the Indians will obtain, in addition to what they have already received, about \$110,000. That is the whole of this proposition in a nutshell.

In the Committee on Indian Affairs the gentleman from Iowa gave notice that he was not satisfied with the proposed settlement. The facts are these: The purchase price, according to the bids, was \$516,851.52; the appraised price was \$256,887.07; the amount paid on the purchase price already is \$360,117.27; the amount of interest already paid is \$75,000, which would give the Indians in the settlement about \$546,000, or \$20,000 more than the land was auctioned off for. The gentleman from Iowa contends the Indians should have every dollar that was bid, with interest thereon from that time.

As a Representative of the district in which those Indians now reside, I for one say, "Yes; I would like to let them have the full amount of principal and interest. But they have been kept out of much of the interest and principal since 1883; and if we hang up this settlement now we do not know whether they will ever get the money." As a representative of the Indians who reside there and whose land was sold, I believe that under the circumstances the Secretary of the Interior has made the best settlement that was possible. I was ordered to report the bill and am here with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CALDERHEAD] to advocate the passage of this act, which has already passed the Senate.

Mr. MERCER. Has the Interior Department fully concurred in this report?

Mr. FLYNN. This bill was drafted in the Interior Department. I never saw it until they sent it to us, asking that it be introduced and passed.

Mr. MADDOX. Has there ever been any question about the appraisement?

Mr. FLYNN. No. The question arose over this proposition. As I have stated, the land was appraised at \$256,887.07 and was bid in at \$516,851.52. Some of the settlers who bid it in refused afterwards to pay what they had bid, claiming that the Commissioner of the General Land Office was there and knew the rascality of some of the Government officials connected with the sale and told the bidders to bid whatever they liked and it would be made right.

Mr. MADDOX. What did the "rascality" consist in.

Mr. FLYNN. As I understand, some officials told the settlers to bid what they liked, and if they would pay \$10 on every one hundred or two hundred their bid would be reduced accordingly.

Mr. MADDOX. Was the amount bid a fair price for the property?

Mr. FLYNN. That is a debatable question. The settlers contended that they bid regardless of what the land was worth, believing that the appraised value, which was fair, would be the price at which they would ultimately get the land.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Allow me to say that I live in the locality where this transaction occurred, and I can say that the appraisement was higher than the market price of the same kind of land at that time anywhere within 50 miles of it.

But the settlers went upon the land for the purpose of buying it and getting the advantage of the long-time deferred payments which were to follow. When they went and occupied the lands, as they supposed, to have the advantage of being settlers at the time that they would bid at the sale—when they went to the sale they found that some kind of an agreement had been made between the land officers and some sharks, some other men with money, who were to bid against the settlers for the purpose of running up the price on them.

Mr. MADDOX. Is this bill unanimously reported from the committee?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. It is a unanimous report, except the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY].

Mr. MADDOX. Does it come from the Committee on Public Lands or the Committee on Indian Affairs?

Mr. FLYNN. Indian Affairs.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. It comes from the Committee on Indian Affairs. Now I ought to yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY].

Mr. SIMS. I want to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FLYNN] a question. I understood the gentleman to say that the reason they bid more than it was worth was that it was understood that by making a side bid to an officer they could have the bid reduced.

Mr. FLYNN. No.

Mr. SIMS. Ten dollars on the side, was the gentleman's language.

Mr. FLYNN. The gentleman did not understand me exactly. I have been told by a gentleman who handled this case in those days that there was great anxiety to secure this land. There was competition in the bids, and, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr.

CALDERHEAD] said, the land was bid up higher than any land within fifty or a hundred miles of it, with an understanding that no matter what they bid they could get the land at the appraised value, which was presumed to be fair.

Mr. SIMS. By paying something to these officers?

Mr. FLYNN. No; they came out under a proposition where it was stated that on the side they were told by some gentlemen who were around there that if they would hand in ten or twenty dollars, their bid would be reduced.

Mr. SIMS. Reduced one hundred dollars for every ten.

Mr. FLYNN. That was my understanding of it.

Mr. SIMS. And that they acted upon that idea.

Mr. FLYNN. Well, they have not paid these Indians since. I do not know what idea they acted on.

Mr. SIMS. Are these gentlemen coming in here with clean hands to complain of a bargain which they tried to avoid by indirection and bribery?

Mr. FLYNN. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Different people are concerned now.

Mr. FLYNN. The contention was that no matter what happened at the time, the Commissioner of the General Land Office was there in person and told them to go on and bid what they liked, with the understanding that they could afterwards secure the land at the appraised value, which was presumed to be a fair value.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Now I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] whatever time he thinks he will need—five or ten minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LACEY. I should like to have the attention of the House briefly. The matter involved in this bill does not concern the Government of the United States in dollars and cents, but it concerns the honor of the Government. This House is, in part, the guardian of these Indians. This proposition is that after men bought certain land at public auction, entering into a written contract to pay the bid price per acre for that land, now the written contract with the Indians is to be treated as null and void, and the land is to be taken away from the Indians and given to these people on an appraisement made seventeen years ago.

That is the proposition, and it is said that it is this or nothing. The settlers say that they had a verbal arrangement with the Commissioner of the General Land Office by which they were to bid on this land, and that after bidding it in they were not to pay for it, or were only to pay for it what it was worth; that it was to be made right with them in some sort of a way. The Commissioner of the Land Office says he made no such arrangement. He denies it absolutely.

These men have for seventeen years occupied this land. They never have paid a dollar of rent on it; they never have paid a cent of taxes on it; they never have paid a cent of interest on it; they never have paid a cent of principal on it, beyond the original partial payments. They have held up these Indians for seventeen years and refused to carry out their contract, and they now come in after all this lapse of time and present an agreement which they forced the Indians to make, to scale the contracts down, the Indians being in Oklahoma and the understanding being that it was that or nothing.

Mr. FLYNN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. LACEY. In a moment. Now, my friend from Kansas [Mr. CALDERHEAD] has stated time and again that he has a letter which will prove that the Commissioner of the Land Office made this sort of an arrangement. I call on him to read that letter to the House. I have thus far been unable to obtain it. I do not understand why these Indians should not have the contract price. In the first place, the land was put up at public auction, and some cattlemen came in and bid the land up with straw bids so as to prevent the land from getting into the hands of settlers and thus enable them to graze the land. That sale was set aside. It was a fraudulent sale. I am told that some men that bid there were sent to the penitentiary for conspiracy. But, be that as it may, that sale was set aside and nobody is complaining of it now. The property was put up again, was bid in at public auction, and these men bought it at public sale, and they got away from the other bidders by overbidding them. They took possession of the land. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FLYNN] says the land to-day is worth forty or fifty dollars an acre. It was bought for from five to fifteen dollars an acre. They have had it seventeen years without rent. I desire to have the Clerk read a letter in this connection—

Mr. FLYNN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question while that letter is being sent to the Clerk's desk?

Mr. LACEY. Yes.

Mr. FLYNN. The gentleman, I know, does not want to misstate any facts. He has stated to this House that they have not paid any principal or interest. I desire to correct that statement.

Mr. LACEY. I do not say the whole of them. I say these settlers who are asking this relief have not paid anything.

Mr. FLYNN. One moment.

Mr. LACEY. Very well.

Mr. FLYNN. About \$360,000 has been paid already—

Mr. LACEY. Yes.

Mr. FLYNN. Paid by the people who bid this land in, and if this settlement is accepted the Indians receive an additional \$111,000 from those settlers.

Mr. LACEY. That merely illustrates another thing in this proposition. Some of the purchasers have paid for their land. They have paid \$360,000 on their bids. They have gone on and carried out their contracts in good faith. Are we to go back now and pay them back the \$360,000 that these settlers who have stood by their agreements have paid? If we let these settlers out who have paid nothing, should not the Treasury reimburse the other men who have paid in good faith and stood by their bids? Why, certainly.

Mr. MADDOX. Will the gentleman allow me—

Mr. LACEY. It seems to me that proposition only shows the greater reason why this bill ought not to pass.

Mr. FLYNN. Let me ask the gentleman from Iowa another question.

Mr. MADDOX. Have not about two-thirds of the settlers paid the price which they agreed to pay?

Mr. LACEY. Not two-thirds, but this amount has been paid. A considerable number of them have lived up to their contracts and have paid the amount of their bids. A large number of others have absolutely refused to pay anything and have appealed to Congress—

Mr. MADDOX. And this bill is to authorize them to settle, is it?

Mr. LACEY. These Indians, unfortunately, are not voters. They live down in Oklahoma and have nobody to represent them. The settlers are on the land—

Mr. FLYNN. I represent them to the best of my ability.

Mr. LACEY. What I mean is that they have nobody to vote for them here. My friend, as a Territorial Delegate, can not vote.

Mr. FLYNN. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly.

Mr. FLYNN. I know the gentleman wants to be fair, and the gentleman is fair.

Mr. LACEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FLYNN. How are these Indians whom I represent going to get their money if this settlement is not approved?

Mr. LACEY. Put the land up and sell it again.

Mr. FLYNN. Yes; but the Nebraska delegation, with all its votes, will be here resisting it on behalf of the settlers who now occupy this land. I have no vote myself, and the Nebraska delegation, with the votes which they will be able to command, have power enough to defeat any kind of a settlement. It is true a Delegate has no vote, and the gentleman from Iowa knows that we can not pass this bill through here with a Department recommendation in favor of it on any other kind of a basis. I say these Indians have been out of this money since 1883, and it is about time for them to get it.

Mr. LACEY. Do you not think they ought to have it?

Mr. FLYNN. How are you going to give it to them unless you do it in this way?

Mr. LACEY. Take the land and sell it to others who will pay for it.

Mr. FLYNN. That is a good thing to talk about, but it takes votes to pass a bill.

Mr. LACEY. It will not get my vote to pass this bill, to take this money from these Indians.

Mr. STEELE. I just want to know of the gentleman, if this is a pernicious bill and he knew it, why did he not object to it when unanimous consent was asked?

Mr. LACEY. I want it considered; I want the House to vote it down, and give notice to these people that a white man must stand by his contract even with an Indian. Now I ask that the letter be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the letter.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I want a little time.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like the House to hear this letter. It is not a mere formal matter.

The Clerk read as follows:

BEATRICE, NEBR., March 17, 1900.

MY DEAR SIR: In my morning paper I have noticed your dissenting report in the Otoe Indian land matter, which has been long pending for settlement in Congress. Your report in the morning paper is as follows, to wit: "Having examined the original evidence and the papers on file in the matters involved in this bill, I can not concur in this report, and believe that the Indians should have the benefit of the contracts made by them at the public-land sales."

In my opinion, your report is eminently just and correct. I attended that land sale. I was quite anxious to buy a quarter section of the Otoe land. I attended the sale, I think, every day that it was held, and it was held several days. There was a conspiracy entered into on the part of certain men to take advantage of the Government in the sale of this land, but that was a secret conspiracy, and there were not many involved in it. There was nothing said at that time by any of the Government officers nor the land commissioner that would lead any bidder to believe that he would get his land for less than he bid. The reason I did not buy was because there were others there who outbid

me and offered more for the land than I thought it was worth. These bidders who were so anxious to deprive others of the right of buying and paying for the land should be compelled to pay the price of their bids, with interest. These bidders who purchased the land had full knowledge of what they were doing, and I have never had a particle of sympathy for the men who crowded other bidders out at that sale and got the lands, and who have been constantly kicking since on the price they bid.

There is a land speculator in this city who bought the 160 acres where the agency buildings stood, at sheriff's sale, for \$100. That is all that land has cost him up to date. He bought it nearly six years ago, and has had the benefit of the crops upon the land since, which probably amount to \$350 per year. He has never paid the Indians or the Government a dollar of the money which the original bidder at the public sale agreed to pay. This man is very anxious to have the Indians' debt scaled down, that he may get this land for a nominal price. I mention this instance as probably an extreme case, but there are doubtless others where speculators seek to take advantage of the circumstances.

I have no financial interest in this Otoe land matter in any manner whatever, but I am personally cognizant of the facts I herein detail, and believe that justice will be done as soon as the Congress of the United States give these Otoe land settlers and speculators to understand that they must abide by their contracts that they made at the public sale. Excuse the liberty I take in addressing you upon this matter, but I believe your course in the Otoe land matter is correct, and I take pleasure in commending you for it.

I am, yours, truly,

E. O. KRETSINGER.

Hon. Mr. LACEY, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

P. S.—The statement of the majority of the committee that the sale was controlled by a drunken mob is the purest rot and has no substance of foundation to rest upon.

Mr. SIMS. Can I suggest a question to the gentleman?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. Can not this bill be now amended and provide for the sale of the land in case they do not pay this debt, with interest, within a stipulated time?

Mr. LACEY. I think it ought to be so amended; and I think it ought to be recommitted with instructions to bring in that kind of a bill, and I will move to recommit with that instruction.

Mr. SIMS. I knew you were on the committee.

Mr. LACEY. I want to read the statement on which this bill is founded, on page 6 of the report.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I do not want the gentleman to use all my time, because I have been generous in giving him time.

Mr. LACEY. Perhaps the Chair will recognize me in my own right.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not understood to have stated whether he yielded specific time to the gentleman from Iowa or such time as the gentleman desired.

Mr. LACEY. Such time as I desired.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I said I would yield him ten or fifteen minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. Five or ten minutes.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Five or ten minutes.

The SPEAKER. Then ten minutes was the limit of the time. The gentleman from Iowa has had thirteen minutes.

Mr. LACEY. I want to be recognized in my own right in opposition to this bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not recognize the gentleman, The gentleman from Kansas has the floor.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. In reply to what has been said—

Mr. LACEY. I would like to have the gentleman give me time to read what he founds his claim upon.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I will give the gentleman five minutes more, if he will make his whole case in that time, so that I can reply to it.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, this involves—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. LACEY. This bill involves for these Indians several hundred thousand dollars of money that belongs to them. I am yielded five minutes now in which to state their rights on this claim seventeen years old. I shall read from an affidavit on which the majority report has founded substantially the whole basis of the claim:

During the sale affiant heard said McFarland publicly announce that the said bidding was too high; that the Government did not want only the appraised price of the lands, and to all who were buying with the intention of making homes the Government would exact only the appraised price of these lands. Affiant further states that at the noon recess of the sale he talked personally with Mr. McFarland, and McFarland told him if he was desirous of purchasing a home on these lands to go ahead and bid it off at any price; that the Government would exact only the appraised price of the lands, as that was all they were worth. Affiant further says that he purchased a piece of said land and was influenced to do so wholly by the statement of said McFarland.

Now, the letter that has just been read states that Mr. Kretsinger went there to bid on the land, and he was outbid by these parties. He says that one tract of land there is worth \$50 to \$60 an acre that a man has paid only \$100 for, and wants to be released now, and have it limited down to the appraised price of seventeen years ago. Just think of it! Land in Nebraska, Indian land, that has been sold in a public auction, now to be adjusted at the appraised value of seventeen years ago. Seventeen years ago Nebraska was a wild Western State. That is 1883. To-day Nebraska is thickly populated. A large majority of gentlemen on

that side of the House turn their faces toward Lincoln, Nebr., when they get up in the morning and pray. [Laughter.] Nebraska has grown to be a great political and financial center, and yet they propose to take this land from the Indians at what it was appraised at in 1883 and give it to the men who during these seventeen years have not paid any taxes, because the land is in the Government; paid no interest, because they have repudiated the contract; have paid no rent, because they owned the land themselves. That is the proposition that this House is called upon to indorse, and now the question is, Will they do it?

Mr. McRAE. Under what Administration was this fraud done?

Mr. LACEY. There is no fraud.

Mr. McRAE. What is it then?

Mr. LACEY. They are trying to get a fraud under Mr. McKinley's Administration through this House. Here is the fraud: They are asking to release these men from their contract, take the money away from the Indians and give it to these gentlemen in Nebraska, and release them from a written contract made in 1883, a contract purchased on a purchase, a second purchase at that, in the open market at public auction.

Mr. McRAE. Does the Department recommend this?

Mr. LACEY. The Department recognizes it in this way: It says that this has been hanging on for a long time; that the settlers have refused to pay; the Department has been against it, but as they have gone around and got 80 per cent of the Indians finally to consent, holding up their hands this way, that they had better close it up and be done with it. It is just as a judge of a court once said, when the jury brought in a verdict taking another man's farm away from him, "That verdict is set aside. It takes 13 men to steal a man's farm in Pennsylvania." It takes 356 men in this House to take this land away from these Indians and release these settlers from their written contract made in 1883; and I give notice that I will demand a yea-and-nay vote upon this proposition.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. How much time have I left, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has thirty-one minutes remaining.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE].

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, the conclusions reached by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] are rather surprising to me when I consider the history of this transaction. Under the conditions when these lands were opened—that is, the main portion of the reservation—settlers were authorized to take them at their appraised value. When the lands in question were opened up for settlement, they were appraised by a board, one of whom was an Indian, and appraised at a price that was so satisfactory that the Indians held a jollification after the appraisement.

When the settlers selected these homesteads they understood that they would be allowed to take them at the appraised value, as had been done when the first part of the reservation was opened; and yet it was held by the Land Office that the Commissioner had a right to direct the public sale, which he did as to this remnant of 42,000 acres of the reservation. That order was made. When the sale came under which this controversy arose, they were assured—as the Committee on Indian Affairs has more than once announced—they were assured by the parties in charge of that sale that in order to protect their rights on the land they had already selected and settled that the Government would never demand more from the purchasers than the appraised value. That has led to a great deal of delay, there being about one hundred delinquents now.

I find, in referring to this sale, this statement in the report of the committee. After having recited the general history of the transaction, it goes on to say:

It would seem, therefore, that up to a short time before the date of sale the parties intending to become settlers upon the land had reason to suppose that if they could become settlers they would be exempt from the necessity of entering into competition with others for the purchase of the lands, and it would be reasonable to suppose that they made arrangements accordingly, supposing that the appraised value would be all they would have to pay.

In addition to these facts it appears that when the lands were put up at public auction the sale was controlled by a mob of disorderly, intoxicated, and irresponsible persons; and the intending settlers seeking to secure lands of their selection, and on which they had previously made settlement in accordance with the spirit and purpose of the law, were brought into unfair competition and serious menace from the mob which had gathered for the purpose of speculation and making trouble, and not for the purpose of making actual settlement of the lands through bona fide purchase.

Mr. LACEY. I want to ask my friend from Arkansas if he believes that story?

Mr. LITTLE. I believe it from evidence in my possession.

Mr. LACEY. Notwithstanding the Commissioner denies it.

Mr. LITTLE. I have never seen any denial by the Commissioner.

Mr. LACEY. That has not been printed in the report.

Mr. LITTLE. I did not write this report, and I only give the facts in it. I think the committee as a rule can be trusted in its written reports. Now the report continues:

It also appears the Commissioner of the General Land Office was present at the sale, endeavored as best he could to protect the bona fide intending

settlers, and assured them, in his official capacity, that no advantage would be taken of the excessive bidding, and that in the end the Government would make a fair and reasonable adjustment, and exact no more from the purchasers than the real and appraised value of said lands. The settlers relied upon these assurances, made the bids necessary to secure the lands, entered upon them, and have reduced them to a high state of cultivation. The community in which they reside is one of the best improved in southern Nebraska. Farms have been opened, schoolhouses, churches, villages, roads, and bridges have been built. The improvements alone constitute more than one-half the present value of the land.

Mr. SNODGRASS rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Arkansas yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. SNODGRASS. What was the object of a competitive sale if it was to go at a minimum price?

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman did not catch my meaning. The Commissioner directed a public sale of the entire remnant of 42,000 acres. The settlers had selected it understanding that it would go under the general law as the other land had before. Then, when this order of sale was made, these lands were put up and sold, these bona fide settlers of homesteads were confronted by these unusual and extraordinary bids for speculative purposes, which would result in the loss to them of their homesteads and give nothing to the Indians except to defeat sale.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Does not the advance price go to the Indians if collected?

Mr. LITTLE. I will meet that in a moment; my time is short. Now, this controversy has stood in the way of final settlement for seventeen years. The settlers of these lands have made their first payment and are anxious to settle on fair and equitable terms. It has harassed Congress at every step on both sides of the question, and it has reached a point where the settlers who have gone on the lands and improved them can not pay for them if they want to. Acting upon these assurances and information, they have from time to time applied to Congress, and from time to time payments have been extended up to this time.

In order to reach what was believed to be a just settlement, what I believe to be absolutely honest to the Indians as well as to the settlers, they have finally reached the settlement approved of in this bill, and that is, that the settlers pay to the Indians the appraised price, which was \$6.42 an acre, plus 25 per cent, making \$8.02 per acre, together with 5 per cent from the date of the sale, which is more than the land is worth to-day if put on the market. This proposition has been submitted to the Indians, and out of eighty-eight or eighty-nine of them, all save some three, four, or five have signed the agreement, and the agreement is here printed in the report.

That agreement is the basis of the bill. That agreement has been assented to by all the settlers except some seven or eight. Not only that, but it has received the indorsement of the Indian Department and of the Secretary of the Interior; it has also met the approval of the Committee on Indian Affairs, excepting only the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SIMS. If these lands were put up now and sold would they bring the contract price with legal interest?

Mr. LITTLE. I do not believe they would.

Mr. SIMS. Suppose we should offer these settlers six months in which to pay up, on the condition that if they did not the land should be advertised and sold?

Mr. LITTLE. That is substantially what the bill does. If the amounts agreed to in the compromise are not paid within twelve months the lands are to be sold. Many of these lands have been mortgaged.

Mr. ZENOR. In reply to the question of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], let me say that the amount bid upon these lands was in excess of the original value of the land.

Mr. LITTLE. Certainly. I was about to say many of these lands are under mortgage now for the improvements, and exclusive of the improvements they would not bring, in my opinion, anything like the amount of the bids.

Mr. SIMS. With the improvements, would they not?

Mr. LITTLE. Possibly in some instances they might.

Mr. SIMS. These men put their improvements on the land at their own risk, taking their chances.

Mr. LITTLE. That is where my friend is wrong.

Mr. SIMS. They have been occupying these lands without paying rent or taxes.

Mr. LITTLE. These purchasers acted upon an assurance which they believed guaranteed them the lands at the appraised value. The Indians themselves, as I have said, have agreed to this arrangement.

Mr. SIMS. Have the purchasers and occupants of this land paid any interest on the amount which they contracted to pay?

Mr. LITTLE. This bill charges them with 5 per cent interest from the date of the contract, being about seventeen years.

Mr. SIMS. Without this bill, what would they pay as interest?

Mr. LITTLE. Five per cent.

Mr. SIMS. Then how are they damaged?

Mr. COX. As I understand, the money which the settlers propose to pay will go to the Indians.

Mr. LITTLE. Certainly; and the Indians have agreed to this bill.

Mr. COX. Who, then, is kicking against carrying out this agreement?

Mr. LITTLE. Nobody except the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. COX. Oh, well, he is always kicking. [Laughter.]

Mr. LITTLE. The fact is that this bill is agreeable to everybody interested. Neither the Indians nor the gentlemen who represent them on this floor make any objections. On the other hand, they are all heartily in favor of it.

Mr. FLYNN. In reply to what the gentleman from Iowa has said, let me say that I drew this report—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE] has expired. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CALDERHEAD] is recognized.

Mr. LITTLE. If I can not have more time, I will ask the privilege of printing in the RECORD the letter of the Secretary of the Interior on this subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE] asks unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of the Interior on this subject. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.
Washington, February 14, 1900.

SIR: By act of March 3, 1893 (27 Stat., 568), the Secretary of the Interior was authorized and directed to revise and adjust, on principles of equity, the sales of lands in the late reservation of the confederated Otoe and Missouri tribes of Indians in the States of Nebraska and Kansas, made at the land office at Beatrice, Nebr., in May and December, 1883, under the act of March 3, 1881 (21 Stat., 380), and in his discretion, "the consent of the Indians having first been obtained," to allow to the purchasers of said lands, their heirs and legal representatives, rebates of the amounts respectively paid or agreed to be paid by such purchasers, the amount of the rebates, however, not to be such as to reduce the price of the lands below the appraised value thereof at the time of the sale.

The circumstances and conditions preceding, attending, and following these sales are set forth with reasonable accuracy and fairness in committee Report No. 2193, made to the House of Representatives on H. R. 12141, Fifty-fifth Congress, third session, and also in the exhibits incorporated in Senate Document 132, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session.

Under the act of March 3, 1893, repeated but unavailing efforts have been made by the succeeding Secretaries of the Interior to revise and adjust these sales on principles of equity, so as to extend the benefits thereof, as contemplated by the act, to both the full-paid and the delinquent purchasers, their heirs and legal representatives. These efforts have been repeated so often and have been so uniformly unsuccessful that it may be safely said that there is no possible hope of making any revision or adjustment of the sales, with the consent of the Indians, which will include both classes of purchasers. According to the terms of the act the consent of the Indians is indispensable to any revision or adjustment thereunder.

In 1896 the then Secretary of the Interior adopted a plan of revision and adjustment of these sales, with the consent of the Indians, which was, however, expressly confined to the delinquent purchasers, and did not extend to those who had made full payment. The question arose as to whether such a partial revision and adjustment conformed to the act under which the Secretary of the Interior was acting, and this question was referred to the then Assistant Attorney-General assigned to this Department, Mr. Lionberger, who, on December 20, 1896, rendered an opinion adverse to said plan of revision and adjustment for the reason that it did not include in its benefits all those purchasers who clearly come within the purview of said act.

November 20, 1899, a revision and adjustment of these sales as to the delinquent purchasers was consented to by the Indians in an instrument in writing, which is in terms as follows:

"We, the undersigned adult male members of the Otoe and Missouri tribe of Indians, having been assembled in council this 20th day of November, 1899, at the Otoe subagency, Noble County, Okla., in response to the request of James McLaughlin, United States Indian inspector, for the purpose of considering a proposition for the settlement of differences with the delinquent purchasers of lands in our late reservation in the States of Nebraska and Kansas, and being fully advised by said Indian Inspector McLaughlin as to our rights and interest in the premises, do hereby agree to a settlement of said differences on the following basis:

"I. The original appraised value of said lands, together with 25 per cent of such appraised value, shall, for the purposes of this settlement, represent the purchase price of said lands.

"II. Interest shall be computed on the purchase price so ascertained at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, simple interest, from the date that interest should be computed under the original act of Congress providing for the sale of said lands to date of payment.

"III. From the amount so ascertained to be due in each instance shall be deducted all payments heretofore made on said lands, both on account of principal and interest, together with simple interest thereon at the rate of 5 per cent per annum from date of payment until date of final payment, and the balance remaining after deducting said payments and interest thereon, as aforesaid, from the purchase price, with interest thereon as aforesaid, shall be considered the amount still due from said settlers and purchasers in each instance.

"IV. All computations to be made under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, and we fully authorize the adjustment of the matter on the basis as above set forth, and as provided by the act of March 3, 1893.

"V. It is further understood that this agreement and compromise shall apply only to the purchase money now delinquent, and that we will in no event agree to any further adjustment or refunding of any money whatever to those who have paid the full amounts due on their purchases made at the sale of said lands."

This is signed by 73 adult male members of the tribe out of a total of 88, which is more than the three-fourths required by the customs of the tribes and the regulations of this Department. Of the adult male members of the reservation at the time all but 6 signed this instrument.

This plan of adjustment does not include the full-paid purchasers, and I do not feel authorized to give it my approval and carry it into effect, considering the provisions of the act of March 3, 1893, and the opinion of the former Assistant Attorney-General, in which I concur. I believe, however, as before stated, that no plan of adjustment which includes the full-paid pur-

chasers will ever be consented to by the Indians, and I further believe that the fact that an adjustment as to the full-paid purchasers can not be effected ought not to be permitted to stand in the way of or to prevent an adjustment as to the delinquent purchasers.

It is now more than sixteen years since these sales occurred, and good administration as well as fair dealing toward the Indians and the delinquent purchasers requires that the matter shall be adjusted so far as they are concerned, so that the Indians may receive the moneys to which they are entitled and the purchasers receive title to the lands. The plan of adjustment consented to by the Indians, November 20, 1899, provides that they shall receive from the delinquent purchasers the original appraised value of the lands with 25 per cent added thereto, and with interest thereon at 5 per cent per annum.

Representatives of this Department, who have inspected the lands and made diligent inquiry with respect to their appraisal and value, believe that this is a reasonable and equitable settlement both for the Indians and the delinquent purchasers. I have had two conferences with delegations from the tribes, and after careful consideration of the matter believe that the best interests of all concerned will be subserved if this plan of adjustment between the Indians and the delinquent purchasers is authoritatively adopted and carried into effect.

This controversy, so long pending, should be closed without further delay. While under the act of March 3, 1893, the consent of the purchasers was not made a condition to the revision and adjustment thereby authorized, it is worthy of consideration that about 110 out of a total of 123 delinquent purchasers have joined in proposing this adjustment and stand ready to comply with its terms, if it be approved. The remaining delinquent purchasers insist either that they should receive title to the lands without making any payment at all or upon the payment of the original appraised value, with interest thereon at 5 per cent per annum for three years. It thus appears that the Indians and the delinquent purchasers have, with practical unanimity, consented to this plan of adjustment.

I therefore respectfully transmit herewith a draft of a bill, confirming the revision and adjustment to which assent has thus been given, and earnestly recommend that it receive your favorable consideration.

Very respectfully,

E. A. HITCHCOCK, Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS,
United States Senate.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Speaker, if I can be heard for a few moments, I think I can save a good many inquiries.

If I had thought that this bill would precipitate such a discussion as we are having, I would not have interrupted the progress of the military bill this morning with this question. I am very sure that my friend from Iowa has widely mistaken the facts and has received a great deal of misinformation on this subject or he would not have made the statement which he has made.

I live within 10 miles of this land. There are 110 or 111 actual settlers upon the land. Ninety of them are the men who went on the land before the day of the sale, thinking that each one of them would be allowed to buy 160 acres at the appraised price, or not less than the appraised price, and that they would thus be enabled to make their homes there. They are still living there, occupying the same land.

When the land was offered for sale, they were met by the men who wrote the kind of letters that the gentleman from Iowa had read to you—bidding against them, running the price of the land up from \$6 to \$17 or \$18 an acre when there was not a quarter section of wild land within 50 miles that would have brought that price at that time. The Commissioner of the General Land Office came to the sale and suspended it for two days, endeavoring in some way or another to relieve the settlers from the competition of those gamblers who were bidding against them. But the conspiracy between the officers of the local land office and the speculators who were bidding against the settlers was close and strong. The speculators continued to run up the price upon those settlers; and I believe it to be true (because I have heard more than twenty men say that they heard the statement made) that the Commissioner of the General Land Office told the settlers that he could not help them at that time, but that they should go on and bid upon the land, and that they would be able to obtain relief from the Government.

Mr. SIMS. If the speculators had bought the land, would they not have had to comply with the terms of the sale, so that the Indians would have got the same amount of money?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. No; that was not the purpose at all. The successful bidders would have acquired an inceptive right to complete the purchase; but the deferred payments were to run for a long time, during which the successful bidders would have been holding presumptively the title. But many of these settlers who bid for the land had gone upon it some time before and erected their little homes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Would these speculators have also got their improvements for nothing?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. They would have got their improvements for nothing, of course. That was a part of the game.

Mr. COX. Now, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I should like to continue this story without interruption, with all respect to my friend.

Mr. COX. All right.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. And when I have finished my statements, if any inquiry is to be made, I will answer it if I can.

The settlers made their first payments at the time of the sale. Some of the settlers who bid at that time made all their payments and completed them, and have obtained their lands at about the appraised price. They completed their payments and obtained

their title, some for one reason and some for another; but these remaining settlers, upon whom the price was extortionately run up by the false bidders at the sale, have remained upon their lands from that day to this, contending every day during all these sixteen years that they were entitled to have that land at the appraised price and the interest due upon it. Three different times Congress has authorized them to make that kind of a settlement with the tribes, subject to the approval of the tribes. This time they have made their settlement with the Indians without the authority of Congress or without any act of Congress directing it.

Mr. LACEY. Let me ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Now, I did not interrupt the gentleman with questions, and I do not care to be interrupted until I get through.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas declines to yield and so stated some time ago.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. This time they have made their agreement with the tribes, and 77 out of 83 adult members of the tribes have signed the agreement. The settlers are to pay the appraised price for the land and 25 per cent more, and they are to pay 5 per cent interest upon that sum from the date of sale down to the date of payment. By that payment the Indians come within \$45,000, in round numbers, of getting as much as they would have got if the settlers had paid up at the date of sale.

Mr. DOLLIVER. On their bids?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. On their bids. It is that close to it now.

Mr. LACEY. But they lose seventeen years' interest.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Upon that \$45,000 they lose the seventeen years' interest, and that is the question of equity and justice for which the gentleman from Iowa stands here contending. These Otoes and Missourias were taken from that reservation down to one of the best reservations in the Indian Territory and given 123,000 acres of the best land in it, and located there. I think they are one of the four richest tribes of human beings on the face of the earth to-day. They do not pay their debts to others, but that is outside of the record in this case. I am unable to induce them to pay the men that built their houses upon their reservation in Kansas, but that is outside of the record. The whole question here now is whether this settlement shall be approved, by which these settlers pay the appraised price on the land and 25 per cent more than that, and pay 5 per cent interest upon that sum from the date of sale down to this time, or whether we shall go without a settlement and open another contest which shall last until time shall determine it in the future. That is the whole of it. Seventy-seven out of 83 of the adult members of that tribe are satisfied with this settlement, after sixteen years of controversy over it, after having the matter explained to them in every direction by their friends and by their enemies.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question now?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. As I understand this controversy, it is this: Before this land was sold the Government required it to be appraised.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. It brought more than the appraised value?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. And the purchasers are trying to get the land at the appraised value, and not at what it brought at the sale. Is that the case?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. That is what they have been trying to get it at, but under this settlement they now pay 25 per cent more than the appraised value and interest on that amount.

Mr. LACEY. The treaty required the land to be appraised.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. And the Indians accept this settlement.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Now, based on that—I take it the gentleman is a lawyer?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Is it not a fact that in every State of the Union, before land is sold at public outcry, it is required to be appraised, generally at two-thirds of its value so that if at the sale it does not bring the appraised value the court, upon its own motion or the motion of the person holding the title, will set aside the commissioner's report of sale?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. That is the general procedure under the statute of a State, but this was under a treaty with the Indians.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I understand; but the procedure generally followed the practice of the State, did it not?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Except that this was prescribed by a statute which directed the sale. This sale was under a statute of this Congress.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. By whom was the land appraised?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. By appraisers appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, one of whom was selected by the tribes.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. And two by the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. And they appraised the land?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. They appraised the land.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. And the property having brought more than its appraised value, the holders of the title, squatters as they were, are now trying to avoid the purchase price. Is not that the fact, boldly stated?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. No.

Mr. SIMS. They are trying to avoid all above the appraised price.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Trying to avoid all over the appraised price?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. These are the settlers who were entitled to go onto the lands under the act which authorized the sale.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Did any of these gentlemen who went upon the lands before the sale have any right there?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Yes; they had the inceptive right of settlers under the act.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Had they the right to go on this land?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Land belonging to the Indians authorized to be sold under the act of Congress.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Yes; and they were admitted to the lands.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Before they were sold?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Yes; and under this settlement the Indians will receive within \$45,000 of the amount that was originally bid. The Indian inspector has been with the tribe and explained the entire matter to them until it is satisfactory to them. The settlement is satisfactory to the Department of the Interior, satisfactory to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, satisfactory to the tribes, and satisfactory to the settlers. No one objects to it except the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY]. Now I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], and then I desire to move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. How much time have I?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has ten minutes remaining.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I will take but a moment to say what I have to say upon this subject. Some six or seven years ago I spent about two months in the vicinity of the lands in question. At that time I heard a very great deal about this sale. I admit that the information I received was hearsay, but I believed what was said to me at the time, and I give it to the House for what it is worth.

One of the gentlemen who was one of the bidders at this sale in speaking of the matter referred to the attempt of certain gentlemen, himself among others, to bid up the price of these lands at the sale. I said to him, "What was your reason?" He said, "First we were to bid, and if the land was given to us at the price we bid it would give us the prior right and an opportunity to make a deal with the settlers and occupants of the land later." He further said to me that there was an understanding between the register and receiver of the land office in charge of the sale and these speculators that they were to run up the price of the land, and then if the poor settlers, the men who occupied and had improved the land, anxious to save their holdings and their improvements, should become fearful that they would not be able to obtain their lands and should implore them not to run the price above what they (the settlers) could afford to pay, they would say, "There is no record being kept by the men who are making this sale of the price at which the lands are bid in. After the sale is over, if you bid a higher price than the appraised value we will see to it that the land goes to you at the appraised value, provided you pay us \$10 for every \$100 that you bid above the appraised value."

That was the general talk in the community while I was there. Nobody denied that that was the condition of affairs. I talked with a number of men who were in this conspiracy; and the men in charge for the Government of the United States in this fraudulent sale went to the penitentiary from matters connected with it, and several of the men who had to do with this attempt to run up the price of this land without any idea of paying it and keeping it themselves also went to the penitentiary for their participation therein. The question before the House is simply this: Will you do justice by the settlers and occupants of these lands; will you give them the lands at the appraised price and 25 per cent more and interest for sixteen years, or will you compel them to pay the exorbitant price drawn from them by a lot of speculators and bidders who were present at this sale, every one of whom should be in the penitentiary?

Mr. ZENOR. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. ZENOR. Do you not know it to be a fact that at the time this sale was made the cattlemen wanted the lands for three or four months for the grazing of cattle, and they only paid \$1, and that was simply to cover the pretended sale; was not that true in every instance in which these lands were sold?

Mr. MONDELL. That was a part of the general conspiracy on that sale by the Government.

Mr. LACEY. That was the first sale, and was set aside.

Mr. MONDELL. I am speaking of the second sale.

Mr. COX. What was done about that second sale?

Mr. MONDELL. They never got any title.

Mr. ZENOR. I will ask the gentleman whether or not there was a sale made of this land and subsequently set aside by the Government? I understood the gentleman from Iowa said that a sale was set aside.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. It was never set aside.

Mr. LACEY. The first sale was not carried out.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, yes; the first sale was carried out. There never has been any sale set aside. The men that I talked with were there at the time the only sale was going on. The land commissioner came there and suspended it for two days trying to prevent these frauds upon the settlers, and finding that he was unable to do it, he let the sale go on.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I now yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple proposition. The men who settled upon the lands in question ask for this bill; the Indians, or a large majority of them, interested in these lands ask for this settlement. The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Hitchcock, has carefully examined this matter and recommends action at once. I quote his words in a communication sent to Congress February 14, 1900:

It is now more than sixteen years since these sales occurred, and good administration, as well as fair dealing toward the Indians and the delinquent purchasers, requires that the matter shall be adjusted, so far as they are concerned, so that the Indians may receive the moneys to which they are entitled and the purchasers receive title to the lands. The plan of adjustment consented to by the Indians November 20, 1899, provides that they shall receive from the delinquent purchasers the original appraised value of the lands, with 25 per cent added thereto, and with interest thereon at 5 per cent per annum. Representatives of this Department, who have inspected the land and made diligent inquiry with respect to their appraisement and value, believe that this is a reasonable and equitable settlement both for the Indians and the delinquent purchasers. I have had two conferences with delegations from the tribes, and after careful consideration of the matter believe that the best interests of all concerned will be subserved if this plan of adjustment between the Indians and the delinquent purchasers is authoritatively adopted and carried into effect.

This controversy, so long pending, should be closed without further delay. While under the act of March 3, 1893, the consent of the purchasers was not made a condition to the revision and adjustment thereby authorized, it is worthy of consideration that about 110 out of a total of 123 delinquent purchasers have joined in proposing this adjustment and stand ready to comply with its terms if it be approved. The remaining delinquent purchasers insist either that they shall receive title to the lands without making any payment at all or upon the payment of the original appraised value with interest thereon at 5 per cent per annum for three years. It thus appears that the Indians and the delinquent purchasers have, with practical unanimity, consented to this plan of adjustment.

I therefore respectfully transmit herewith a draft of a bill confirming the revision and adjustment to which assent has thus been given, and earnestly recommend that it receive your favorable consideration.

His predecessor, Hon. C. N. Bliss, also investigated this whole subject, and favored legislation of this character. Writing to Congress, January 28, 1899, he said:

In response to your request you are advised that this Department fully appreciates the desirability of an early settlement of the long-standing controversy respecting the lands. If such a result can be obtained, the best interests of the local community, the settlers, the Indians, and the General Government will be conserved.

Mr. Speaker, this is a Senate bill, and the same language as above quoted was used in the Senate report. This bill has passed the Senate of the United States, and by our favorable action it will go to the President of the United States and soon become the law of the land. It will be a Godsend to those settlers who have been fighting so many years for this relief.

The Committee on Indian Affairs of this House has made a favorable report upon this bill and urges its passage in the following language:

The contention is already of nineteen years' standing, and there is every reason why the latter should now be closed up. It is right that the purchasers should acquire their titles and that the Indians should have their money. A generous concession has been made by the tribes and your committee is assured that the settlers and the legal representatives now in possession will concur in a final adjustment under the provisions of this bill. The amendment herewith reported is intended to furnish the specific details for carrying out the settlement and fixes a suitable period within which the same may be accomplished.

The period of one year was the time named in the former act, known as the "Paddock bill" (27 Stat., 568), and seems reasonable in view of the suggestions made by the settlers that many of them will be obliged to obtain the purchase money by mortgage upon their tracts of land, and that recourse to the courts will be necessary to clear the title of certain supposed liens, which in fact are not such, in order to make it a merchantable title upon which money can be secured.

The object of the proposed bill is to give the Secretary of the Interior a

form of judicial power to settle these controversies, so that he may act advisedly; that testimony may be taken, and a competent attorney may be appointed by the Secretary to appear and look after all the interests of the Indians in the hearings, and to present their case on that testimony and any other competent to the issue. The General Government owes a duty to these Indians, to the community where the land is situated, and to the settlers to adjudicate this matter in accordance with the rule of right. We believe that the proceedings authorized by this bill will bring about that result.

These lands are not in the district which I have the honor to represent; but they are located in part in Kansas and in part in Gage County, Nebr.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MERCER. Certainly.

Mr. LACEY. Whose district are they in?

Mr. MERCER. The Nebraska land is situated in the Fourth Congressional district, represented by Mr. STARK, my colleague, and the Kansas land in the district represented by Mr. CALDERHEAD.

Mr. STARK. I am right here.

Mr. MERCER. I will say, Mr. Speaker, as has been said before, the Commissioner of the Land Office holding office at the time the public sale took place reported that bona fide bidders were being interfered with by speculators, and he assured those who did buy in good faith at the time they were buying that if they were imposed upon by excessive bidding he himself, as the representative of the Government, would protect them when the time for settlement came, and the Secretary of the Interior—

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERCER. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the settlers that paid in full for the land at this auction, and who exceed the number affected by this bill, can not come here and claim a reduction based upon this proposition?

Mr. MERCER. They have been contending for such a settlement, I understand, for a good many years.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. The men who paid in full. If you remit to these men, will they come in here and ask for a refund?

Mr. MERCER. I am informed that the Department is opposed to such action. But these settlers in question have settled upon this land, have built homes, have built outbuildings, have plowed the soil, have planted crop after crop, and they have a certain vested right in these lands, a vested right that should be protected by Congress; and when the settlers and the Indians and the Interior Department and the Senate of the United States and the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House of Representatives all ask for this legislation, why should you hesitate a moment?

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. I ask the gentleman to yield to me for a few minutes.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks for the previous question.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. I ask the gentleman to yield a minute or two minutes of his time to me as a member of the committee.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I will give you a minute. I withhold the request for the previous question for a minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the demand for the previous question, and yields the gentleman from New York one minute.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. I can not support this bill as a member of the committee. This bill is intended to relieve a party or a number of men who bid at a sale from the obligation of their contracts. The Department and these Indians have finally consented to this compromise, because after seventeen years it has been impossible for the Indians to get anything out of them; and driven to the last resort, they are compelled to take what they can get. Such a proposition I can not give my assent to. More men bid at this sale and paid the amount that they bid at that auction than are included within the provisions of this bill for relief.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I will extend your time a little if you will allow me to ask you a question.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. Certainly.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Does the gentleman understand that under the provisions of this bill the settlers pay the appraised price and 25 per cent additional?

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. There are only 111 affected by this bill, and there were, as I understood, nearly 200 men who bid at this sale.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. I understood the gentleman to yield to me more time if he could ask me a question.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I think, Mr. Speaker, I must insist on my motion for the previous question.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LACEY) there were 87 ayes and 12 noes.

So the previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time; and it was read the third time.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That this bill be recommitted with instructions to report back a bill for an immediate resale of the lands.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LACEY) there were 11 ayes and 89 noes.

Mr. LACEY. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. Three gentlemen rising, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are denied. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LACEY) there were 104 ayes and 13 noes.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. CALDERHEAD, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House bill lie on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that order will be made. There was no objection.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a report of the agreement of the conferees on the pension appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin reports an agreement by the conferees on the pension appropriation bill, and the Clerk will read the report.

Mr. BARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the report be dispensed with, and that the statement be read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks that the reading of the report be dispensed with and that the statement be read. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the statement.

The statement was read, as follows:

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6827) making appropriations for the payment of pensions, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report, namely:

On amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, limits the number of examinations to be made by boards of medical examiners to not exceeding 20 on any one day, as proposed by the House, instead of 10, as proposed by the Senate, and makes a verbal correction in the text of the bill.

On amendment numbered 6: Restores the provision requiring examining surgeons to state the rating which in their judgment applicants are entitled to, and which was proposed to be stricken out by the Senate, and leaves in the bill the provisions proposed by the Senate defining the duties of examining surgeons and requiring that the reports of special examiners shall be open to inspection.

On amendment numbered 7: Strikes from the bill the provision proposed by the House requiring the Commissioner of Pensions to furnish all necessary blanks to claimants and giving him the discretion to refuse to pay the fees to any attorney of record when he is satisfied that such attorney failed to prepare the case under his personal supervision and did not discharge his full duty to the claimant.

S. S. BARNEY,
J. T. McCLELLAN,
JNO. C. BELL,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the report.

The motion was agreed to.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill making appropriations for the Army.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SHERMAN in the chair, for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of an appropriation bill the title to which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8382) making appropriation for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 477. An act granting a pension to Levi C. Faught.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9279) making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 5067) concerning the boarding of vessels.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 733) entitled "An act concerning the boarding of vessels."

Senate concurrent resolution 26:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 2,500 copies of the work entitled *The Louisiana Purchase*, by the honorable Commissioner of the General Land Office of the United States, 1,500 copies for the use of the Senate and 3,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its sitting.

The Clerk read as follows:

For contingent expenses of the military-information division, Adjutant-General's Office, including the purchase of law books, books of reference, periodicals and newspapers, and of the military attachés at the United States embassies and legations abroad, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, \$6,640.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have listened with a great deal of interest during this debate to a number of very able speeches on all sorts of subjects; but I have thus far sought in vain any light or leading upon the question of the total cost of the maintenance of our military establishment. Under the present custom of distributing appropriations for the military establishment, it is almost impossible to obtain a total without going through the different appropriation bills item by item and line by line and word by word. I have no doubt that the only proper and correct method of dealing with appropriations for the military establishment is to carry them all on one bill which should be reported by the Committee on Military Affairs.

I have gone through a number of appropriation bills item by item and line by line. I have examined six in all which carry appropriations for the military establishment. For all I know there may be other appropriations, other items, hidden away on other appropriation bills; but, so far as I am able to discover, for the present fiscal year and during it there have been appropriated for the military establishment as follows: On the Army bill, \$80,430,204.06; on the Military Academy bill, \$575,774.47; on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, \$2,424,032; and on the sundry civil appropriation bill, \$1,036,765.24. And I may state incidentally that the latter two bills carry the great majority of the 2,140 clerks now employed in the War Department for the permanent establishment of the United States; that is, a proportion of about 1 clerk to 42 enlisted men, assuming the figures of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to be correct—that our Army is not within 10 per cent of the total limit allowed by law.

Besides these amounts, there was carried on the urgent deficiency bill \$45,930,977.61, giving a total of \$130,387,753.38.

Now, that does not include the fortification appropriation bill. If we include the fortification appropriation bill, which was extremely small last year—\$4,990,900—we reach a total for the permanent establishment of \$135,297,653.38.

Mr. STEELE. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he includes in his table the cost of construction and transportation?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Oh, certainly. The gentleman will understand that I am submitting these figures without comment, simply for the information of the House.

Mr. STEELE. I understand that; and the preparation of the gentleman's table must have cost a great deal of work.

Mr. McCLELLAN. This statement includes transportation and construction, but not any appropriations growing out of the civil war or the Spanish war.

During 1897 the Austro-Hungarian army, 354,196 strong, cost in round numbers \$56,000,000; the French army, 538,759 strong, cost in round numbers \$125,000,000; the German army, 598,000 strong, cost in round numbers \$136,000,000, and the Italian army, 273,000 strong, cost in round numbers \$45,000,000. All the war budgets of the continental armies include not only the cost of maintaining the standing army itself, but the charges arising

from past wars. Thus the war budget of Germany, which is \$136,000,000, carries with it the cost—

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask that the gentleman from New York be allowed to proceed five minutes longer.

Mr. HULL. I object. The gentleman is not speaking to the part of the bill now under consideration—

Mr. RICHARDSON. This is upon the question of expenditures for the Army.

Mr. HULL. That will come up later.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is purely a military question which we are discussing.

Mr. HULL. We want to get through this bill before Friday, and it will be impossible if we stop to discuss all these questions not immediately relevant.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I hope the gentleman will not object to this extension of time, because the gentleman's remarks are right along the line of the bill.

Mr. HULL. There is no objection to the gentleman printing additional remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then the gentleman does not make the point of order that what I have said is not germane and should not be published in the RECORD?

Mr. HULL. Not at all; I think the gentleman has a right to publish it in the RECORD.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the gentleman does not desire me to go on, I will not insist; but I will take advantage of the general leave to print and conclude my remarks in the RECORD.

I was about to say, when interrupted, that the war budget of Germany, which is \$136,000,000, includes the expenses arising from the war with France and the war with Austria, and that the French war budget, which is \$125,000,000, includes the expenses arising from the late war with Germany, as does also the Austro-Hungarian budget. These expenses include pensions and claims, etc. If we are to make an accurate comparison between the cost of our Army and the armies of Europe, we should add to the appropriations for the support of the Army for the current year the appropriations growing out of the civil war and our other wars. These amount to \$156,291,688.63, making our total war budget on the German, French, or Austro-Hungarian basis amount to \$291,589,342.01.

Now, again, assuming that the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs is correct, that our Army is 10 per cent less than the maximum, or 90,000 strong, we find that the cost of maintaining each enlisted man of the United States Army is not a thousand dollars a year, as is generally supposed; but if we exclude the appropriations for fortifications, it has amounted during the present fiscal year to \$1,447; if we include the appropriations for fortifications, it has amounted to \$1,503; and should we estimate on the European basis, including our expenditures for pensions, etc., it has amounted to \$3,240.

Now, in 1897 the cost per annum for each enlisted man was, in the Austro-Hungarian army, \$157; in the French army, \$232; in the German army, \$227; and in the Italian army, \$165. Had it been possible to maintain our Army as cheaply as those of continental Europe, it would have cost us at the Austrian rate, \$14,130,000; at the French rate, \$20,880,000; at the German rate, \$20,430,000; and at the Italian rate, \$14,850,000. In preparing these figures I have used round numbers in referring to continental armies and have used the latest reliable data I have been able to obtain, which is for the year 1897. In estimating the cost of the United States Army I have not included river and harbor work or any appropriations for civil purposes. I have, however, included all expenditures made directly for the maintenance and support of the military establishment.

The cost of the military establishment per capita of population is in Austria, \$1.25; in France, \$3.25; in Germany, \$2.59; in Italy, \$1.47; and in the United States, including appropriations for fortifications but not including appropriations growing out of past wars, is \$1.93. The per capita of expenditures growing out of past wars is \$2.23, and the total per capita of the cost of the present military establishment and expenses growing out of past wars is \$4.16.

Let me again say, in conclusion, that I have submitted these figures for the information of the House, without comment and without criticism.

TABLE A.—Appropriations for the support of the military establishment, fiscal year of 1900.

Carried on—	
Army bill	\$80,430,204.06
Military Academy bill	575,774.47
Legislative, executive, and judicial bill	2,424,032.00
Sundry civil bill	1,026,765.24
Urgent deficiency bill, act February 9, 1900	45,930,977.61
Total	130,387,753.38
Fortifications bill	4,909,900.00
Total	135,297,653.38

APPROPRIATIONS GROWING OUT OF PAST WARS.

Pensions	\$145,233,830.00
Salaries for Pension Bureau, etc., carried on legislative, executive, and judicial bill	2,371,250.00
National cemeteries	205,880.00
Artificial limbs	549,275.00
National Homes for disabled volunteer soldiers	3,654,544.00
State homes for disabled volunteer soldiers	900,000.00
Arrears of pay, bounty, etc.	450,000.00
Miscellaneous, arising chiefly from war with Spain	2,765,000.00
Headstones and burials	28,000.00
Deficiencies, National Homes, disabled volunteer soldiers, and claims, act February 9, 1900	133,949.63
Total	156,291,688.63
Aggregate	291,589,342.01

TABLE B.—Showing cost of maintaining various armies.

	Population, in millions.	War budget, in millions of dollars.	Total army, peace footing.	Cost of maintaining 1 enlisted man for one year.	Cost of military establishment per capita of population.
Austria-Hungary	44½	56	354,196	\$157.00	\$1.25
France	38½	125	538,759	232.00	3.25
Germany	52½	136	568,000	227.00	2.59
Italy	30½	45	273,029	165.00	1.47
United States, not including pensions, etc.	70	135	90,000	1,503.00	1.93
United States, including pensions, etc.	70	291½	90,000	3,240.00	4.16

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I desire to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to a state of facts which to me seem inexplicable. I have no doubt that an intelligent answer to a few questions which I desire to propound will shed much light upon doubts now in the minds of members of the House.

In the early part of January last I had put through the House a resolution of inquiry, asking the Secretary of War to inform the House what the cost of military operations in the Philippine Islands had been from May 1, 1898, up to and including November 1, 1899. I knew this was a question of interest to the American people, and I thought that the cost of those military operations would largely determine their judgment upon this question. In responding to that inquiry the Secretary of War said that the total cost of military operations in the Philippine Islands during the last eighteen months had been, in round numbers, \$48,000,000.

Now, I should like to have the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs inform the House what has become of the balance of the money we have appropriated. The last military appropriation bill, if I remember correctly, carried eighty-odd million dollars. A deficit supplied in the short session of Congress carried about \$25,000,000 more.

Mr. HULL. More than that.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. More than that, the chairman says. The present bill carries one hundred and twelve millions. Now, if it has only cost \$48,000,000 for the military operations in the Philippines within the last twelve months, I should like to have some intelligent explanation as to what has been done with the rest of this vast sum of money that we have appropriated. We have but a handful of soldiers in Cuba, we have scarcely a corporal's guard in this country, and we have sixty-odd thousand in the Philippines. If it has only taken \$48,000,000 to conduct military operations in the Philippine Islands for eighteen months, then what has become of this hundred and odd million dollars that have gone to the War Department?

I frankly confess that there are but two solutions to this inquiry. One is that the response of the Secretary of War does not state the fact, and the other is that we have been appropriating more money than was needed to conduct military operations. I desire to call attention to the fact that this does not include money appropriated for fortifications. It is confined purely to the military question about which I am speaking, the transportation of soldiers, clothing of soldiers, commissary department, and things of that sort. The Secretary of War says that we have expended for these 65,000 soldiers only \$48,000,000, and yet we have appropriated about \$250,000,000. Where has the balance of it gone? What have we done with it?

Mr. DRIGGS. I am going to show what became of it.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. No; you can not show.

Mr. DRIGGS. Yes, I can.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. The fact of the business is that this answer is not a fair one. The Secretary of War does not deal fairly with the House. It is true I can find some excuse for it. He has been so busy drafting appropriation bills for the benefit of the members of the majority that he has not had time perhaps to

pay attention to the details of his own Bureau, but he is content in replying to this resolution of Congress with transmitting a few letters from bureau chiefs. He does not undertake to go into the details of it.

That is very well, gentlemen, for you to sit quietly in your places and permit a creature of the President to reply to a resolution of one of the branches of Congress in this way; but I direct your attention to the fact that it is not dealing fairly with the House of Representatives or treating your resolution with sufficient respect. Many of the figures given are merely estimates. The Secretary of War makes no effort to give an actual statement of the cost of the departments over which he presides, and he gives such an equivocal statement that the conclusion is forced upon the mind of an intelligent citizen of the Republic that he is either incompetent or that he does not know the business of the Department that he professes to control.

Every man knows that we have spent more than \$48,000,000 in the Philippines in the last eighteen months. If we had conducted operations there so economically as that, I am sure that this military appropriation bill, under the guidance of the very efficient gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], would not carry much more than one-half of what is demanded.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. HULL. Do you want more time?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. No; I simply want an answer, and then I may want more time after I hear from you.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INSPECTOR-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

Contingencies, Inspector-General's Department: For contingent expenses of the Inspector-General's Department at the offices of the several department inspectors-general, being for the purchase of the necessary articles of office, toilet, and desk furniture, binding, maps, books of reference, and police utensils, \$1,000.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHEELER] for a moment, I desire to say that the resolution to which he has just been speaking was referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs and by them reported to the House, and the answer which the gentleman has criticised was received in response to that resolution. It was placed before the Committee on Insular Affairs. Personally I did not examine it in detail, but it was examined by the minority members of that committee, and no criticism was passed upon it by them. I understood, and I think the committee generally understood, that it had been submitted to the gentleman from Kentucky and that the answer was satisfactory to him. Of course I must be mistaken about that.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I will ask for an extension of the gentleman's time if he desires.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Oh, no. I simply desire to make this statement for the benefit of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I desire to say that the sending of the resolution to the Committee on Insular Affairs was not through any desire on my part. I think it properly belonged to the Committee on Military Affairs; but after the resolution went to the committee I never heard of it until it was reported here, nor did I ever hear of the report until some ten days or two weeks after it had been submitted to the House, and then I got it from one of the officials at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I can only say that it was the intention of the committee to elicit the information which the framer of the resolution, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHEELER], intended to elicit, and I regret that there has been any misunderstanding upon the subject, because I am quite sure that we intended to give him all the information which his resolution called for.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I hope the gentleman will not think that I am reflecting on the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I did not understand it, but I simply wanted to make that explanation.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, just one word more. So far as the Committee on Military Affairs were concerned, they were not charged with any investigation of this kind and did not go into it; but we were charged with finding out the amount necessary for the support of the Army for the next fiscal year, and did go into that question.

I assume that the report from the Secretary of War was made as to the expense of the Army while in the Philippines proper, or upon Philippine territory, and if confined to that I should imagine that the Secretary of War has given the full amount that it would cost there. If it was intended to cover the expense of the enlistment of soldiers, their clothing and equipage, their transporta-

tion to the Philippines, and the return of soldiers from the Philippines, of course it would be utterly inadequate.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. HULL. I do not know what the resolution said.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. My friend will pardon me. I will simply state that the resolution was framed with a view to getting the entire cost of military operations, and it contained the words "the cost of military operations."

Mr. HULL. In the Philippines?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. In the Philippines, including equipment and supplies.

Mr. HULL. That would apply to equipment of troops after they reached the Philippines and while they were there. If the gentleman was inquiring as to the cost of maintaining the Army, that was a different thing. The Committee on Military Affairs were charged with that. We had these different bureau officers, who were charged with the disbursement of this fund, before our committee, and the majority and minority members asked all the questions they wanted to and arrived at a unanimous conclusion. To say that the reply of the Secretary of War means that \$48,000,000 would cover the expense of the Army, the 100,000,000 men authorized by the last Congress, is simply absurd.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Well, I will say that I have the report here—

Mr. HULL. By your own confession I think his reply confines it to the expense while the troops are in the Philippines.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Will the gentleman permit me to read just a little from General Meiklejohn's response, in which the body of the resolution is set forth?

Mr. HULL. Let me ask the gentleman if he claims that that response applies to the cost of maintaining the Army?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I do, most emphatically. That is what I was trying to get.

Mr. HULL. Then I will say to the gentleman that either he was unfortunate in the language of his resolution or the War Department were unfortunate in their construction of it.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Will the gentleman tell us what the cost of military operations in the Philippine Islands has been?

Mr. HULL. No; I did not inquire as to the Philippines proper, and neither did the Military Committee.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. We all know what the cost of maintaining the Army has been, because your bill shows that.

Mr. HULL. That includes all the cost of the whole Army.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Your bill shows that it cost so much.

Mr. HULL. The pay of a man—his regular wages—costs so much whether he is in the Philippines, or in Iowa, or in Kentucky. It costs more to send supplies to the Philippines than it would to Iowa or Kentucky. The item of expense of the transport service says something about the cost of taking soldiers over and returning them, and taking supplies over there for their maintenance while there.

For this fiscal year we appropriated \$80,000,000 for the support of the Army, in the regular appropriation bill. The law providing for the Army at the time the appropriations were made had not been agreed to by both Houses. As it finally passed it largely increased the amount necessary, and this Congress has supplied the deficiency. The War Department came to Congress with its showing on the deficiency. That matter did not come to the Committee on Military Affairs. It went to another committee, the Committee on Appropriations.

After investigation there as to what had been done with the \$80,000,000, they investigated how much there was asked for and how much they should allow for the balance of this present fiscal year, and appropriated it. We come in now only for the fiscal year beginning on the 1st day of July, 1900, and the hearings before the committee show that we have made a liberal allowance for the coming fiscal year, and with the chance that all of it will probably be used.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Now, before the gentleman takes his seat, as this is a matter I take a great interest in, I will say to him that I have a verbatim copy of the resolution which is transmitted with Mr. Meiklejohn's response, making it competent for the gentleman to say whether or not under this resolution the War Department was expected to transmit to Congress the entire cost of the army in the Philippines, including the transportation and everything of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HULL. I do not raise any question as to time.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I desire the chairman of the committee to answer this question.

Mr. HULL. I will answer it if I can.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Iowa be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. The language of the resolution is as follows, to state:

The amount of money expended—

This is a verbatim quotation—

The amount of money expended and the amount, so far as he is able to state the same, for which the Government is liable, remaining unpaid, for equipment, transportation, supplies, and the military operations in the Philippine Islands from May 1, 1898, up to and including November 1, 1899.

Now, I ask the gentleman from Iowa if, under the language in the resolution, it did not become the duty of the War Department to furnish the House information as to the total cost of all military operations in the Philippines?

Mr. HULL. In the Philippines, yes. But to do that they have got to separate each enlistment in the Army; they have got to separate the cost of sending each man to the Philippines, starting him from the day of enlistment. I never heard of this proposition, I will say to the gentleman. It did not come to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I am sorry it did not; I tried to get it there.

Mr. HULL. I will say to the gentleman that the cost of the Army as a whole is all that the Committee on Military Affairs went into. We did not try to segregate except as to the charge for each department, the amount for subsistence, the amount for the Quartermaster's Department, the amount for the Pay Department proper of the Army, and all these different items, but made no attempt to go into the question of how much of that would be expended for the army in the Philippines, how much for the army in Cuba or in Puerto Rico, or how much for the army that was not outside of the limits proper of the United States; so that I am not in a position that I would be competent to give an expression as to the different items, except as to the subsistence of the Army, camp equipage, and the different items, except as we find them appropriated for in the bill.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I would like the gentleman to permit me a moment on this subject.

Mr. HULL. Certainly; on any question that affects this bill.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I desired some information on this subject, and I frankly confess I was without any partisan motive in having this resolution passed.

I am sincere in the position I have taken in regard to the ultimate determination of what the American people shall do with the Philippine Islands; and while it has unfortunately become a partisan question, it is a matter fraught with such pregnant importance to the American people that I believe myself capable of rising above any mere partisan advantage on the subject, and I believe that the American people would be largely influenced in arriving at a settlement of the matter by the question of cost. Therefore I wanted a frank statement from the War Department as to the cost of military operations in the Philippine Islands. I am not satisfied with this statement that has been made.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman object to my making a little further statement to him now?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Certainly not.

Mr. HULL. The evidence before the Military Committee and an examination of the appropriation bills dating back for fifteen or twenty years demonstrates that the cost of the military establishment, meaning the officers, soldiers, and all connected with it, averages about a thousand dollars a year per man.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I am well aware of that; and probably more than that in active operation.

Mr. HULL. More than that now.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. What I desired to know, and what the people of the United States desired to know, was what we were paying for the pleasure of holding the Philippines or for the glory of holding them; and I state that this statement made by the War Department is equivocal and unfair or it is a viciously ignorant one, because there is not an intelligent citizen of the Republic who does not know that we have spent from \$48,000,000 to \$90,000,000 there within the last eighteen months or two years.

I do not believe that the Secretary of War ever read that report; and if he did before giving it to the House of Representatives it is a stultification on his part or a confession of gross incompetency. What right have we to pass this bill, for which I expect to cast my vote, appropriating \$112,000,000 of the people's money, to be used in the next twelve months, and be confronted with a deficit of \$25,000,000 or more in the short session of Congress, when they are expending less than one-third of the sum in eighteen months for the maintenance and support of our Army here?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Signal Service of the Army: For expenses of the Signal Service of the Army, as follows: Purchase, equipment, and repair of field electric tele-

graphs, signal equipments and stores, binocular glasses, telescopes, heliostats, and other necessary instruments, including necessary meteorological instruments for use on target ranges; war balloons; telephone apparatus (excluding exchange service) and maintenance of the same; electrical installations and maintenance at military posts; maintenance and repair of military telegraph lines and cables, including salaries of civilian employees, supplies, and general repairs, and other expenses connected with the duty of collecting and transmitting information for the Army, by telegraph or otherwise, \$97,000.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill why this increase from \$47,500 to \$97,000?

Mr. HULL. I will say that there is an increase in the demand for the reason that the army is on the advance in the Philippines, and they want to be connected by telephone and telegraph. There is a large additional expense, and, as I believe, it will continue for the next year before all the departments are connected with the headquarters by telephone or telegraph at Manila.

The Department states that it was impossible, even after we made the last increase, to say whether that would be sufficient or not, for the reason that the troops in Manila, in the various departments, are constantly increasing their demand, and gave this as one of the illustrations, where they get to-day a cable, say, for fifty telegraphers, to-morrow another would come increasing the order for a hundred, on the ground that we were occupying new territory, and it is cheaper and more economical for the Government to connect by electricity—telegraph and telephone—than to keep a large detachment there to hold the place. This increase was made in the interest of economy to continue this work as rapidly as possible. If communication is rapid and sure, a much smaller force can be left to hold towns.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

For the purpose of connecting headquarters, Department of Alaska, at St. Michael, by military telegraph and cable lines with Fort Egbert, Cape Nome, and other military stations in Alaska, \$450,550: *Provided*, That commercial business may be done over these military lines under such conditions as may be deemed, by the Secretary of War, equitable and in the public interests, and that the sum hereby appropriated shall be immediately available.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 8, insert, after the word "interests," the following: "all receipts from such commercial business shall be accounted for and paid into the Treasury of the United States."

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the point of order has been reserved.

Mr. McRAE. I want to reserve a point of order to this paragraph.

Mr. HULL. I will send to the Clerk's desk, Mr. Chairman, and have read a letter from the War Department.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be temporarily laid aside.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT, Washington, February 7, 1900.

SIR: I have the honor to inform you that the War Department has this day transmitted to Congress, through the honorable Secretary of the Treasury, a supplemental estimate of appropriation under the title of "Signal Service of the Army," for the ensuing fiscal year, amounting to \$450,550, for the purpose of constructing military telegraph and cable lines between the headquarters of the Department of Alaska, at St. Michael, and Fort Egbert, Cape Nome, and other military stations in Alaska.

It is requested that the subject of this estimate be considered in connection with the estimates for the support of the Army now pending before your committee, and, for the reason suggested by the Chief Signal Officer in his endorsement to the Secretary of War of the 3d instant, "that operations must be commenced in April of this year, in order to utilize the short summer season for the work," it is also requested that the funds, if appropriated, may be made immediately available upon the approval of the act.

Very respectfully,

ELIHU ROOT, Secretary of War.

Hon. JOHN A. T. HULL,

Chairman Committee on Military Affairs,
House of Representatives.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Arkansas would like any further information, I have a document submitted to Congress by the Treasury Department and by the colonel commanding in Alaska and by General Greely. It simply goes on to tell us of the great importance not only of making it, but making it at this time in connecting headquarters; otherwise during the last part of the year it is difficult to get communication in any way.

Mr. McRAE. I suggest that the document be printed in the RECORD. It seems to me that all this expense in Alaska, where we have very little use for an army, is useless.

Mr. HULL. I will say to my friend from Arkansas that the expense up there is increasing, and by the large rush of people there, not only our own people, but others, a large increase in this appropriation is demanded.

Mr. McRAE. We do not need a large army up there.

Mr. HULL. The condition of affairs in Alaska, so sparsely settled as it is, you have got to have troops at the mining districts or else you will have riot and bloodshed.

Mr. McRAE. I do not see the use of any big army there.

Mr. HULL. It is not a big army; it is a small army distributed at many points that are practically inaccessible and ought to be connected, as England has already connected her country in the Klondike, with telegraph facilities.

The document offered by Mr. HULL is as follows:

SIGNAL SERVICE OF THE ARMY.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 10, 1900.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith, for the consideration of Congress, copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, of the 7th instant, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for Signal Service of the Army, \$450,550, the same to be made immediately available.

Respectfully,

O. L. SPAULDING,
Acting Secretary.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WAR DEPARTMENT, Washington, February 7, 1900.

SIR: I have the honor to forward herewith, for transmission to Congress, a supplemental estimate (\$450,550) of appropriation for "Signal Service of the Army," required by the War Department for use during the ensuing fiscal year, and to request that the funds, if appropriated, may also be made available upon approval of the appropriation act.

Very respectfully,

ELIHU ROOT,
Secretary of War.

The SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

WAR DEPARTMENT, ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, January 27, 1900.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose herewith a key map of Alaska, on which is indicated, by red lines, a proposed military telegraph route, together with table of approximate distances between points named.

This route is intended to connect all the military establishments at present in Alaska, and brings Cape Nome, the chief point of interest at this time, in communication with an open harbor throughout the year.

It is thought that the wire for this line can be laid most of the distance upon the ground with perfect safety and, with everything in readiness to begin work at the opening of navigation, can be constructed throughout its entire length in one season.

I would ask that this matter be referred to the Chief Signal Officer for estimate of material, etc., and, if the plan meet with the approval of the Secretary of War, that the Signal Bureau be directed to furnish a suitable officer and a sufficient number of experienced men to take charge of the work.

Very respectfully,

G. M. RANDALL,
Colonel Eighth United States Infantry,
Commanding Department of Alaska.

The ADJUTANT-GENERAL UNITED STATES ARMY,
War Department, Washington, D. C.

[First indorsement.]

WAR DEPARTMENT, ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
January 27, 1900.

Respectfully referred to the Chief Signal Officer for remark and recommendation for the information of the Secretary of War.

H. C. CORBIN, Adjutant-General.

[Second indorsement.]

WAR DEPARTMENT, SIGNAL OFFICE,
Washington, February 3, 1900.

Respectfully returned to the Secretary of War with the following remarks and recommendations. The growing commercial importance of Alaska and the prospective future of that country, as indicated by the best experts, show conclusively that a system of communication for this Department should be undertaken at once for the proper control and economical administration of this district. It is thought that the area can be controlled with a much smaller military force, and therefore much more economically and efficiently, by a proper system of communication between isolated forts.

In making estimates, however, for the lines herein requested difficulty is experienced, due to the very unusual conditions which exist in this region. The local high prices, the almost entire absence for any kind of transportation in the interior, and the impracticability of transporting and erecting poles over a large portion of this line makes it necessary to use in a large measure especially adapted insulated wire, in some sections laid directly upon the ground.

This largely increases the expense of the first cost of material, and makes the most careful estimate that can be made largely tentative in character, and the one herewith submitted is deemed to be as low as the work can be constructed. It contemplates the usual course, the work being done by the troops, under the direction of a Signal Corps detachment, and the necessary transportation being furnished by the Quartermaster's Department.

The line is divided into sections, with estimates for each section, and it should be understood that the cutting down of these estimates means the abandoning of a particular section. It is believed that, notwithstanding the comparatively large amount of money estimated for them, these lines are a necessity, and should be undertaken in the next open season of the country, as recommended by the department commander, whose headquarters, now at St. Michael, are entirely isolated from Washington seven months each year.

It should be clearly understood that the greater part of this telegraphic system is an absolute military necessity, as without it the department commander can not reach any of the posts during the critical winter period of the year.

It is announced that the Dominion of Canada has appropriated \$350,000 to connect its stations in the Klondike telegraphically with Quesnelle, but this affords no facilities to the commanding general, Department of Alaska. The Chief Signal Officer, therefore, recommends that the inclosed estimate be submitted immediately with favorable indorsement, through the proper channels, to the chairman of the Military Committee, House of Representatives, with a view to incorporating this estimate in the Army bill for the coming fiscal year.

The necessity for the appropriation being available is owing to the fact that operations must be commenced in April of this year, in order to utilize the short summer season for the work.

A. W. GREELY,
Brigadier-General, Chief Signal Officer, U. S. A.

Estimates of additional appropriations required for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, by the Signal Corps of the Army.

WAR DEPARTMENT—SIGNAL SERVICE.

Signal Service of the Army:

For the purpose of connecting headquarters Department of Alaska, at St. Michael, by military telegraph and cable lines, with Fort Egbert, Cape Nome, and other military stations in Alaska: *Provided*, That commercial business may be done over these military lines under such conditions as may be deemed, by the Secretary of War, equitable and in the public interests, and that the sum hereby appropriated shall be immediately available. (Submitted) \$450,550

NOTE.—This telegraph system is an absolute military necessity, as without it the commanding general, Department of Alaska, will be unable, for the greater part of the year, to reach and conduct military operations with the military posts under his command.

The detailed estimates are as follows:

Valdez to Fort Egbert, 385 miles, at \$150 per mile.....	\$57,750
Fort Egbert to Fort Yukon, 285 miles, at \$150 per mile.....	42,750
Fort Yukon to Fort Gibbons, 363 miles, at \$150 per mile.....	54,450
Fort Gibbons to Fort St. Michael, 605 miles:	
50 miles submarine cable, at \$900 per mile.....	45,000
553 miles of land cable, at \$200 per mile.....	111,000
Fort St. Michael to Cape Nome, 144 miles of submarine cable, at \$900 per mile.....	129,000
Total.....	440,550

The cost of equipping stations (\$10,000) is not included in their detailed estimate.

The above system connects by the most direct line all the important military posts in the department.—A. W. Greely, Brigadier-General, Chief Signal Officer, U. S. A.

Mr. McCLELLAN. How many troops are stationed in Alaska?

Mr. HULL. Three or four companies.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I do not insist upon the point of order.

Mr. MANN. I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois renews the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Pending the point of order—

Mr. HULL. Then the gentleman reserves the point of order?

Mr. MANN. Yes; I reserve it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to discuss the point of order?

Mr. MANN. Pending the discussion of the point of order, I would like to discuss the—

Mr. HULL. I will say that if the gentleman wants to raise the point of order, I concede it.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I understand the point of order can easily be made. I understand this situation pretty well, Mr. Chairman; we have been discussing the question of laying cables for a long time. The War Department is anxious to have the authority to lay all the cables it can, not only in Alaska, but to Hawaii, the Philippines, and across to Japan, and everywhere else. If cables are to be laid, they ought to be laid by some other Department, and ought to be under the control of the Post-Office Department after they are laid. This provision is inadequate, I think. I think the connection ought to be made, but I do not think it ought to be done in this way by the War Department.

Mr. HULL. This does not propose to do anything but connect the different headquarters of these troops with the central power in Alaska.

Mr. MANN. This proposes to connect—and if I am wrong I would like to be informed about it—this proposes to connect by a cable, which will be used for commercial purposes a great deal more than it will be used for military purposes. It is perfect nonsense to talk about putting it there for military purposes. The estimated distances are as follows:

From Valdez to Fort Egbert, 385 miles; from Fort Egbert to Fort Yukon, 285 miles; from Fort Yukon to Fort Gibbons, 363 miles; from Fort Gibbons to Fort St. Michael, 605 miles, and from Fort St. Michael to Cape Nome, 144 miles. The estimates in detail will be found on page 3 of the document I hold in my hand.

So far as the other point is concerned, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] has an amendment that will probably cover all that objection, for it is true that this telegraph line might be used for some commercial purposes. The primary and only object, however, of the Government in laying this cable is to connect these widely separated commands, so that orders can readily pass from one to another. For instance, between the two places first named the distance is 385 miles. If you should send a vessel that distance, it must be done at great expense and with great delay. The next distance is 285 miles, the next 363 miles, the next 605 miles, and the next 144 miles. The distances between these places make it absolutely imperative that there should be telegraphic connection in the interest of good government and in the interest of economy.

I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I ask that my amendment may be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts which, without objection, the Clerk will again read.

The amendment of Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts was read, as follows:

On page 4, line 8, insert, after the word "interest," the words "all receipts from such commercial business shall be accounted for and paid into the Treasury of the United States."

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The only object of this amendment is that the receipts from the commercial operations of this telegraph and cable shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States. I think there will be no objection to the amendment.

Mr. HULL. The amendment is eminently proper. I think the arrangement which it proposes would be carried out anyhow; but the amendment makes it clear that it shall be done.

The question being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of officers for length of service, to be paid with their current monthly pay, \$1,129,300: *Provided*, That hereafter length-of-service pay of all officers of the Regular Army holding commissions in the provisional army shall be paid on their rank in the Regular Army.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. I raise a point of order on proviso beginning at line 15. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I would say that under the law as it stands at present—section 12 of the act approved April 22, 1898 (30 Stat. L., 363), providing that "all officers and enlisted men of the Volunteer Army, and of the militia of the States when in the service of the United States, shall be in all respects on the same footing as to pay, allowances, and pensions as that of officers and enlisted men of corresponding grades in the Regular Army"—under that section these officers have their longevity pay computed on the salary they receive as volunteer officers.

Now, if this Volunteer Army of ours were a permanent establishment, I might not raise this point of order; but as it is a Volunteer Army which is to exist for only a year or so more, and as the officers who are affected by this provision were selected because of their meritorious record, I do not think it proper that we should at this time change the general law by a provision of this sort.

Mr. HULL. Can the gentleman refer to any law which gives this longevity pay now?

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. I have just read it.

Mr. HULL. What law is it?

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. Section 12 of the act approved April 22, 1898.

Mr. HULL. What does that provide as to longevity pay?

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. I have just read the provision—"that all officers and enlisted men of the Volunteer Army, and of the militia of the States when in the service of the United States, shall be in all respects on the same footing as to pay, allowances, and pensions as that of officers and enlisted men of corresponding grades in the Regular Army."

Mr. HULL. That does not apply in this case.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. Yes, sir; it does; and I will show the gentleman. Volunteer officers who served in the Regular Army previous to 1898, when they went into the service of the United States, did not get any commission from the Government, but went in from one of the States. While in the United States service they got longevity pay computed on their salary as volunteer officers for the length of time they had previously served in the United States Army. A United States officer holding one of these commissions is on exactly the same footing as a man who had previously resigned and then accepted a commission.

As I said before, if this Volunteer Army were a regular establishment to continue indefinitely, I would not raise the point of order, but it affects only about 200 officers, selected because of their good record; and while they are in the service of the country—a large majority of them out in the Philippines—I do not think it comes with good grace for us to pass this provision which cuts them down in this amount.

The average amount, as I say, on less than 200 officers affected is about \$15 a month, and the total saving would be about \$35,000. Now, I do not think it good policy to change the general law to save \$35,000 at the expense of the men in the field at the present time.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I want to say for the benefit of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLAYTON], if he has finished what he wanted to say—I do not want to interfere with him—

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. Very well.

Mr. HULL. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I thought he had concluded.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HULL. I want to say that this matter, in my judgment, is not subject to a point of order and does not change existing law, as suggested by the gentleman.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. Well, now—

Mr. HULL. It is simply a limitation or a regulation as to how

a fund appropriated by this Congress shall be computed. If that is a change of law, to that extent it would be subject to the point of order.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Let me suggest to the gentleman that if he strikes out the word "hereafter"—

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. These men are now receiving a certain salary which they get under the general law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was about to call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to the word "hereafter," which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] has just called his attention to. With that word in it it is certainly more than a limitation upon this appropriation.

Mr. HULL. If this is stricken out on the point of order I shall offer an amendment with the word "hereafter" omitted.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. It changes the existing law.

Mr. HULL. It does not affect any officer in the Regular Army in his lineal place in the Army. It only affects those who have secured high positions in the volunteer service, large promotions over what they had in the Regular Army, and from grades which are still occupied by others of the same class who graduated from West Point at the same time.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. That has nothing to do with the point of order. The gentleman is pleading the merits of the case now.

Mr. HULL. So did you. We have both pleaded to the merits of the case. I admit this is not directly on the point of order. If these men get the pay of the higher grade and the longevity pay to which they are entitled on account of their service in the Regular Army, the committee believes that is sufficient and that they ought to be confined to that longevity pay while receiving the emoluments and benefits of a higher grade than other men in the Regular Army, which all the others would be delighted to have. While it may affect only \$30,000, that makes no difference. The question is as to the justice of it, if it was only one dollar.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. HULL. Well, let the Chair rule.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. I should just like to say one word, Mr. Chairman, in opposition to what the gentleman has said. These officers receive this higher pay, but they are called upon to exercise more authority and bear more responsibility, and they are entitled to that extra pay, and I submit that they are now being paid under a just law.

Mr. CAPRON. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. Yes.

Mr. CAPRON. I should like to ask the gentleman if a captain in the Regular Army, who is selected to be a colonel in one of the volunteer organizations simply because he is a friend of the appointing power or of the governor of a State or for some other reason, no matter what—

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. I will say to the gentleman that these selections—

Mr. HULL. Wait a minute. If this officer is commissioned as a colonel of a volunteer regiment, if he gets his compensation as colonel, over and above the compensation which he would otherwise receive as a captain, is not that a sufficiently material increase of compensation for that officer when there are in the service two or three hundred other officers equally deserving but not able to obtain a volunteer commission—officers of equal length of service? Why should that one officer receive longevity pay beyond all these other worthy officers of his class, to which class he will return at the end of his volunteer service?

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. Because his new commission imposes upon him greater duties, more responsibilities, and harder work—

Mr. CAPRON. For which he is amply paid by the increased pay of his new rank.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. I did not bother the gentleman from Rhode Island. Now, let him wait until I get through. His new commission sends him into the field, into a more responsible position, with more difficult duties to perform; and his selection, if it is honestly made, shows that he has fitted himself for the exercise of this higher command, and is entitled to the pay and emoluments of that rank. Now, Mr. Chairman, these men are paid under a general law—

Mr. CAPRON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman seems to lose the idea of what the longevity pay is for.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. I ask for the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HULL. Then I offer the following amendment.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Provided, That length of service pay of all officers of the Regular Army holding commissions in the provisional army shall be paid on their rank in the Regular Army.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I did not quite catch the reading of that.

Mr. HULL. The only difference between the amendment that I offer and the provision reported by the committee is to leave out the word "hereafter," in line 16, so that it makes it apply to this appropriation only.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. Who recommends this legislation?

Mr. HULL. The committee.

Mr. MAHON. Is there any recommendation from the War Department?

Mr. HULL. None, except that one officer of the War Department when he was before the committee was asked if he thought there would be any injustice in the provision, and he said he thought not.

Mr. MAHON. I have had a little experience with the War Department, and there are several gentlemen up in that Department who feel disposed to take all the honors of the late war to themselves, although they have earned the greater part of their military record behind screened desks, and they are disposed to strike at the men who are in the field. Now, there is some purpose in this amendment.

Mr. HULL. Let me say to the gentleman right here now that this provision was reported by the committee without a suggestion from the War Department.

Mr. MAHON. That is what I am asking.

Mr. HULL. And I wish to say that the War Department, under the present law, has construed the matter in favor of giving the increased longevity pay to every man, whether in Washington, in the Philippines, in Cuba, or in any other part of this country, on the basis of the temporary command that he is now holding.

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. HULL. So that the remarks of the gentleman as to the War Department are not just.

Mr. MAHON. You propose to take from these men what the present law gives them.

Mr. HULL. No; what the present regulation gives them.

Mr. MAHON. You propose to reduce their pay. That is the whole proposition.

Mr. HULL. We propose in this amendment to give the man who is appointed a colonel of a volunteer regiment, but appointed from the Regular Army, practically by detail, the same longevity pay which is received by his brother officers who have had equal length of service in the Regular Army, but who have not been fortunate enough to secure these desirable commissions. A captain in the Regular Army is given a commission as colonel of a provisional regiment. Now, we propose to give him, as colonel, the same pay as would be given to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON], if he were commissioned as a colonel of one of these volunteer regiments.

Mr. MAHON. Do you not mean this—

Mr. HULL. And in addition to the pay which the colonel would get who was appointed from civil life, the man who is appointed to be a colonel, but who has heretofore been a captain in the Regular Army, would get the longevity pay that he has earned by reason of his service in the Regular Army as lieutenant and as captain.

Mr. MAHON. You propose that a captain of the Regular Army who led a regiment into the field, as a colonel of a volunteer regiment—you propose to give him the same pay as you give a captain who has spent his life in the bureau from the day he left West Point up to the present time.

Mr. HULL. Not a bit of it. The gentleman does not know what he is talking about. We give him the pay of a colonel.

Mr. MAHON. I mean the longevity pay.

Mr. HULL. Take the case of the colonel of the Fifty-first Iowa. He was with his regiment in 16 battles. He got the \$3,500 a year, which is the regular pay of a colonel. Now, the colonel of a regiment who had been a captain in the Regular Army got the pay of \$3,500—

Mr. MAHON. I understand that—

Mr. HULL. And in addition to that he got the longevity pay of a colonel. If he had been in for twenty years he got 40 per cent increase of pay up to the limit provided by law, which fixes the maximum pay of a colonel at \$4,500. If he was a captain of cavalry he got \$3,500 plus \$800, making \$4,300. And yet his rank is the same as that of the volunteer.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. That statement is not—

Mr. HULL. That statement is absolutely true.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. Let me tell you why it is not.

Mr. HULL. Let me finish, then.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. I can show you why it is not.

Mr. HULL. That is absolutely true. This provision does not cut him off from the longevity pay that he is entitled to by his rank as a captain in the Regular Army. That he is entitled to and

ought to have. But there is no reason why, holding a temporary position, whether in the field or in the Department at Washington, a higher commission in the Volunteer Army than his regular rank in the Regular Army—there is no reason why he should have not only the pay of the rank, which we concede, but an additional perquisite in longevity pay that he has not earned in that rank, or in the ranks of major and lieutenant-colonel leading up to the position of colonel.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. Will the gentleman yield to me for a minute? I should like to state one thing.

Mr. MAHON. This longevity pay is to pay for this provisional service.

Mr. HULL. Oh, no.

Mr. MAHON. That is your amendment. You apply it to this appropriation.

Mr. HULL. This will apply to this appropriation for this fiscal year.

Mr. MAHON. I know that, but my position is as to this appropriation that these men who serve in the field should have the longevity pay of the rank that they hold in the field during the time of the service.

Mr. HULL. He does not serve long enough to earn it. It takes five years to earn it. Practically the volunteers are never in long enough to earn longevity pay.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. I know a man who was appointed colonel in the volunteer service in 1898. He had twenty years' service, but he had resigned. Only for the fact that he had resigned, in such a case as this, under this proposed amendment, he would get his 40 per cent of colonel's pay. But if he had not resigned from the Regular Army he would only get 40 per cent on the pay of a captain. Now, I submit it is not right to make this distinction.

Mr. HULL. I do not think that is correct. He would get the longevity pay of the rank in which he had earned it.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. Do you say that is not correct?

Mr. HULL. I do. If the proviso prevails he would get longevity pay as on a captain's salary, and not on that of a colonel, as now.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. Under the construction, I know he did, because I know of the individual cases. Now, because a man happens to resign he would be in a better position than the man who had held his commission in the Regular Army. That is what it is under this proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I wish to submit an amendment to that section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman submits an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of line 18 the following:

"To the heirs of officers in the Regular Army who have died since January 1, 1898, two months' extra pay, to be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that that is not in order.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I would like to have the gentleman reserve his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa raises the point of order against the amendment. Does the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order until I make my statement?

Mr. HULL. I have no objection to reserving the point of order to permit the gentleman to make a statement.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I wish to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to the manifest injustice, as I understand the law, that was done to the families of officers of the Regular Army, under the provisions of the act which was passed March 3, 1899, and which reads as follows:

That the act of January 12, 1899, be, and it is hereby, amended so as to authorize the payment to the legal heirs or representatives of the officers and enlisted men who died or were killed or who may die in the service, the extra pay provided for in that act for officers and enlisted men who have been or are to be mustered out.

Now, Mr. Chairman, under the operation of that act the officers and men who were a part of the volunteer service and who died in the service, their families and legal representatives were paid this extra month's money, but the families of the officers of the Regular Army are denied this payment. I can not see where the justice of that measure lies; and I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if that statement I have made on the floor just now is not true?

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, there is quite a difference between the Volunteer and the Regular Army. Under the terms of that act those in the Volunteer Army who served abroad were given two

months' extra pay, and those who served at home were given one month's extra pay. The Regular Army is a life position. The officer is paid for it, as it is his business to serve in the Army. He does not throw up a position and go into the Army for a few months to the neglect of his own business and then come back and take up the tangled threads again, as the volunteer officer did, and therefore I must insist on the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. One moment. The officers of the Regular Army have obtained this extra two months' pay and the enlisted men also, but the families of those officers and of those men that were killed in Cuba or died in the service have been denied this amount of money. I am sure if live men are entitled to the money, the families of those who have been killed in battle or died from disease are deserving of recognition.

Mr. HULL. That is not a correct statement. That alluded to men who had enlisted in the Army for the war only in the Regular Army, and they were given the two months' extra pay.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. But their families have been denied any extra money.

Mr. HULL. The Department has prepared a ruling on that matter.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. It was given to the officers and the enlisted men, but families of those who died in the service have been denied this two months' extra pay.

Mr. HULL. This is not the place to settle that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For additional pay for length of service, \$875,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to that paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, after line 24, page 4, the following:

"To the heirs of enlisted men in the Regular Army who have died since January 1, 1898, two months' extra pay, to be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

Mr. HULL. I raise the point of order against that amount. We can not take that out of the extra-service pay for men who are alive. This appropriation provides for the number that are on the list, and could not cover an entirely different expenditure.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. That applies to men of the Regular Army that died in the service, so that their families can be paid.

Mr. HULL. We are not appropriating for this fiscal year, but for another year, commencing July 1 next.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. You can amend this bill so as to cover cases where the Government has not done justice.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained on the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, after which the gentleman offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 24, page 4:

"That in all cases where an officer or enlisted man in the Army of the United States died since the 1st day of January, 1898, the heirs or legal representatives who paid the cost of burial shall be reimbursed by the United States in a sum not to exceed \$35 for privates, and in the case of the burial of officers \$100, irrespective of any expense incurred by the Government."

Mr. HULL. I raise the point of order against that amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I ask the gentleman to reserve the point of order while I make a statement. Referring to a decision made by the Comptroller on that subject—

Mr. HULL. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, under the decision made by the Comptroller, as is reported in the decision made November 1, 1899, is the following:

The soldier was killed in the battle at El Caney July 1, 1898, and was buried there, presumably at the expense of the United States. It does not appear in evidence, but it is assumed that the remains of the soldier were brought north under the direction of the Secretary of War, provision for which was made by the act of July 8, 1898.

And, Mr. Chairman, the War Department made the ruling and put it into practice allowing \$35 for the family of a soldier killed in battle for the payment of burial expenses, and \$100 in the case of an officer. Now, the Comptroller has ruled that where the bodies were taken from the field of battle and thrown into a trench they were buried by the United States Government, and has refused the payment to the legal representatives of those who fell in Cuba. I say that this decision is an outrage, and I think Congress should place it beyond the power of any official of the Government to negative the plain intent of the Government in this way. In many cases the families of these soldiers are unable to bear the burden of burial, and the Government ought to be willing to give this small pittance. If the Regular Army soldier was a constant voter, I suppose his case would get greater consideration.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, there is another part of the bill that deals with this question. It would not be proper here under

any circumstances, but there is another part of the bill that makes provision for soldiers and civilian employees of the Government who die in service of the Government.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman agree—

Mr. HULL. I will make an agreement when the time comes. The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

PAY TO CLERKS AND MESSENGERS AT DEPARTMENT HEADQUARTERS AND AT HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY.

Nine clerks, at \$1,800 each per annum.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman's point of order apply to different parts of the section?

Mr. McRAE. I make it first to the paragraph beginning at line 3. That is increasing the number of clerks, and is really a change of law.

Mr. HULL. I will say to the gentleman from Arkansas that that same argument would apply to the first two provisions running down to line 6.

Mr. McRAE. It would apply it to the first, second, and third paragraphs when increases are made in pay or number.

Mr. HULL. Suppose the gentleman lets the provision be read applying to the general-service clerks down to and including line 16?

Mr. McRAE. I have no objection to that if my point of order is reserved to all of the paragraphs read.

Mr. HULL. I will agree that the gentleman shall not lose any of his rights, and then we shall have the whole matter before us.

Mr. McRAE. Reserving my right, Mr. Chairman, to make a point of order against the whole or any part of it, I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read, with that reservation. The Clerk read as follows:

Nine clerks, at \$1,600 each per annum.

Thirty clerks, at \$1,400 each per annum.

Sixty clerks, at \$1,200 each per annum.

Eighty-two clerks, at \$1,000 each per annum.

Eleven general-service messengers, at \$840 each per annum.

Fifty-seven general-service messengers, at \$720 each per annum.

Mr. HULL. Now, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, we had this question up last year, and the contention of the Committee on Military Affairs was that this does not increase the number by a single clerk, but increases the compensation. The compensation is fixed each year by the appropriation bill only. There is no other provision in regard to it that I know of, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS], as I remember, in the chair, overruled the point of order last year when raised on just this provision. If the point was reserved, I would send to the desk and have read the reasons that influenced the committee in making this increase, not in the number of clerks, but the increase in the compensation.

I want to say that this increase is honestly earned by the clerks. They have been serving and performing duties at a less compensation than the clerks in the other parts of the War Department, working side by side, have been getting for the last thirty years. For instance—this does not go to the point of order—but the chief clerk of the General Commanding the Army has a compensation of \$1,200 a year, while in all the other bureaus of the War Department the clerks performing the same service get \$1,800. This is an adjustment of salaries to make them harmonious with those of other clerks of the Department. So far as I am concerned, I believe it is absolutely just, and I do not believe that on an appropriation bill, where the salary is fixed from year to year, it is subject to a point of order as to the adjustment of salary, while a point of order would lie against the increase of the force.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, if that proposition were true, we would have no limitation whatever upon Congress in appropriations for clerks, etc.

Mr. HULL. Oh, yes, we would.

Mr. McRAE. Here they take 18 clerks receiving \$1,200 and give 9 of them \$1,800 and 9 of them \$1,600, and then they go down to where they have 100 clerks and reduce them to 82. While he does not increase the number of people employed, he does largely increase the salaries of some and the aggregate amount paid. I submit to the Chairman that each one of these paragraphs must stand alone. I make the point first against the one including lines 3 and 4, against the change of the salary paid the men. It is unnecessary for me to take up the time in discussing the matter, because I know the Chairman is perfectly familiar with the principle, and I think the gentleman is mistaken when he says that the point of order was overruled a year ago by the present Chairman.

Mr. HULL. In reply to the statement of the gentleman from Arkansas that if the committee could report such amount of appropriation under this head as it pleased from year to year, there

would be no protection to the Government, I assume that this House is some protection to the Government and that its members will pass upon questions of this kind with a view to the interests of the Government. Suppose, on the other hand, the committee should report a general reduction all along the line; that would be subject to a point of order if this is.

Mr. McRAE. My point is that this is not the place to make an increase of this kind, even if proper. We have a Civil Service Commission, and we have the different Executive Departments, whose duty it is to look after the promotion of the clerks under the regulations and law. If each committee having jurisdiction of an appropriation bill could in this way take care of its own friends and increase their salaries five or six hundred dollars whenever they pleased, where would the practice end? It is wrong in principle, and is a species of favoritism that ought to stop.

Mr. HULL. Let me say to my friend that the Civil Service Commission and the promotion bureau could only provide for promotions up to the limit authorized by law. There is no law fixing this compensation other than appropriations made from year to year in the appropriation bill.

Mr. McRAE. If the law is wrong, change it in the proper way.

Mr. HULL. There is no law other than what we are enacting. There is no place where the compensation of these employees is fixed except on the appropriation bill passed from year to year. That being the case, we have the right to say that the pay of any of these officers should be reported in the bill at \$1,800, \$1,600, or \$900, and this House has a right to say whether it will adopt our proposition or not.

Mr. McRAE. We may have the power, but it is one we ought not to exercise; and, so far as I am concerned, I am not content to have salaries increased here in this way to any extent that we may desire, upon the judgment simply of one committee, that can not know anything about the services of the clerks in question except what may come to them as secondhand information.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, in looking up the record, discovers that the basis of the decision made by the gentleman from Illinois while occupying the chair last year was a statute which provides as follows:

Each head of a Department is authorized to employ in his Department such number of clerks of the several classes recognized by law and such messengers, assistant messengers, copyists, watchmen, laborers, and other employees, and at such rates of compensation, respectively, as may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year.

So that the decision of the gentleman from Illinois last year was based upon a provision of law for whatever number of clerks Congress chose to appropriate in any particular Department—which is a proposition differing distinctly from that suggested by the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. McRAE. But in this case the gentleman admits that we have nothing except the current law, and consequently we are bound by it. There can be no question about this being an increase over current law.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, no; here is a general statute providing that so many clerks of the several classes named shall be employed in a Department as Congress chooses to appropriate for. That is the law which permits us to make this appropriation; and it presents a different state of facts entirely from one where there has been no statute whatever and where we are dependent entirely upon a former appropriation.

Mr. McRAE. I understood the gentleman from Iowa to say that there was no law regulating this matter; and if there is any, I ask that it be read.

Mr. HULL. My suggestion was that the only authority of law is in the appropriation bill passed from year to year.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to the Chair that the ruling of the gentleman from Illinois, as found in the RECORD, must be followed by the present occupant of the chair, unless the present situation is shown to differ from that then presented.

Mr. CANNON. I care nothing about the merits of this matter; but the Chair will indulge a single remark, that the particular clause of the statute under the heading of a particular Department, referred to in that decision, treats of the Departments proper—the Interior, the War, the Navy, the Post-Office Department, and so on. Now, the employees at present under consideration are not clerks of class 1, 2, 3, and 4, nor are they messengers. They belong to the military establishment as contradistinguished from the various Departments. I feel quite sure that such is the interpretation of the statute referred to. If the Chair had the statute before him I would be glad to call his attention—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not the statute before him. The section as read by the Chair is found in the RECORD in connection with the ruling made by the gentleman from Illinois last year.

Mr. CANNON. I do not think that the statute refers to the clerical assistants at Army headquarters or in connection with the Quartermaster-General or the Commissary-General in the

Army proper. Nor do I think it refers to clerical assistants aboard ship or anywhere except in the Departments. That is my recollection of the statute. I see the Chair has the statute before him.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, the discussion has proceeded upon the theory and upon the admission of the gentleman from Iowa that that was the statute which classified these clerks, and the appropriation is not made by classification, but is an increase in salary over that appropriated for last year.

Mr. CANNON. The Chair will notice in section 163 that it is provided that—

The clerks in the Departments shall be arranged in four classes, distinguished as first, second, third, and fourth classes.

That is under the head of "Executive Departments." Now, section 169, after speaking of the clerks, messengers, assistant messengers, laborers, and watchmen, says:

Each head of a Department is authorized to employ in his Department such number of clerks of the several classes as are recognized by law, and such messengers, assistant messengers, copyists, watchmen, laborers, and other employees, and at such rates of compensation, respectively, as may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year.

The CHAIRMAN. Since the gentleman from Illinois has called the attention of the Chair to this statute wherein it refers to classified clerks, the Chair is of the opinion that this section does not come within the class contemplated by the statute. The Chair will be glad to have this section passed over for a moment until he can send for a report that is referred to here which he has not now before him.

Mr. McRAE. As far as I am concerned, if it will facilitate the consideration of the bill, I am willing that the paragraph should be passed, not only for a few moments, but until to-morrow or later in the evening, if it is desired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it will only take a few moments.

Mr. HULL. I want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact, however, that the only compensation fixed for these clerks or that has ever been fixed is in the appropriation bills from year to year.

The CHAIRMAN. But that is not the point that we are speaking about now. The question now is whether the statute contemplates simply clerks in the Department proper or whether it contemplates covering clerks at the Headquarters of the Army.

Mr. HULL. I have no objection to passing over it, if the Chair desires.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, that provision will be temporarily passed over.

Mr. HULL. The Clerk can read, then.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, \$276,880.

And said clerks and messengers shall be employed and assigned by the Secretary of War to the offices and positions in which they are to serve.

Mr. MAHON. I raise the point of order against the paragraph which has just been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania raises the point of order against lines 19, 20, and 21.

Mr. MAHON. That is clearly new legislation and a change of existing law.

Mr. HULL. That has been in every appropriation bill every year for some years. It is intended to prevent the bickering of the different Departments.

Mr. MAHON. The Secretary of War can not employ men under the civil-service law in this way.

Mr. HULL. We pass this language every year.

Mr. MAHON. That does not make any difference. You violate the law every year, then. It is a change of existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Iowa the last appropriation bill before him?

Mr. HULL. The last appropriation bill reads as follows:

And said clerks and messengers shall be employed and assigned by the Secretary of War to the offices and positions in which they are to serve.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will strike out the word "employed"—the Secretary of War can assign them, but he can not employ them under the law.

Mr. HULL. He assigns them to the positions in which they are to serve.

Mr. MAHON. Yes, but he must have them certified. If these men are now authorized by law, they must be certified from the Civil Service Commission, and that is where the Secretary of War must get his men.

Mr. HULL. Yes, but they are not assigned by the Civil Service Commission to certain employment.

Mr. MAHON. He can assign them when he gets them, but he can not employ them.

Mr. HULL. I do not care whether you have the word "employed" or not. The word "assigned" is the important word. It is the same thing that we have had for many years.

Mr. MAHON. The Secretary of War can assign them.

Mr. HULL. When you come to these messengers, I do not know whether they are under the civil service or not.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa state that this is the same as the provision of last year?

Mr. HULL. Yes; identically the same; and before that, for many years.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MAHON. One moment. This only applies to specific appropriations each year, and it does not follow that because we allowed it in the past they can be legally employed in this way in the future. We give to the Secretary of War the right to employ 158 men whose salaries run from \$1,200 to \$2,000, and these men are under the civil-service law, and if he wants men for these places he is bound to ask for them from the Civil Service Commission. Then he can assign them to any place he sees proper. If the gentleman will strike out the word "employed," I do not think that amendment will change existing law.

Mr. HULL. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that if they are all under the civil-service law the words here mean nothing, because the Secretary of War could not employ them in any other way if they are under the civil service.

Mr. MAHON. Take out the word "employed," then.

Mr. HULL. If any of these messengers are not under the civil-service law, you may, by striking this out, deprive him of the right to employ messengers which he now has the right to employ.

Mr. MAHON. All those are over twelve hundred, and are covered.

Mr. HULL. Oh, no; some of the messengers run down to \$720.

Mr. MAHON. It would not cover those, but it would cover the others.

Mr. HULL. I do not know whether it will cover all or not. These words do not do any harm, because they do not change the method of their selection. They are simply following the rule that has been followed, and I have never had my attention called to it. The question has not been raised before since I have been in Congress, and I think it had better remain just as it is.

Mr. MAHON. All right; but if this section goes through, the Secretary of War can employ these men and assign them, regardless of the civil-service law, because this is a law which we are passing now, and I think that is the intention.

Mr. HULL. The gentleman can move to strike the word out.

Mr. MAHON. I move to strike out the word "employed."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the words "employed and." The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not care to discuss that motion, of course. I want to obtain some information from the chairman of the committee or some one on the committee. Is there any provision in the bill to pay officers in the Army serving in a higher capacity temporarily?

Mr. HULL. Oh, yes; that is the law now. We have an appropriation in here to amend what is already the law, and we have a proviso that the committee will offer, when the proper time comes, to limit it.

Mr. SPIGHT. Can you refer without inconvenience to the section where that occurs?

Mr. HULL. We will reach it in a little while. These are for men on the staff of the Army proper. If you will allow the reading to go on, we will reach it soon. I think it is page 14, lines 19 and 20.

Mr. SPIGHT. Thank you.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of 10 junior veterinary surgeons, \$9,000: *Provided*, That the additional veterinary surgeons provided for in this bill shall be graduates of some recognized veterinary college: *Provided further*, That junior veterinary surgeons shall be allowed and paid monthly the sum of \$3.71 during the entire period of their service in lieu of the clothing allowance of a sergeant-major.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the whole proviso of the first paragraph on page 11.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold the point of order just a minute? It is clearly subject to a point of order. We have now ten veterinary surgeons in ten regiments of cavalry. It is a provision for ten veterinary surgeons, and they will all have to be selected. We have only ten veterinary surgeons. That only classifies them as senior and junior. They are now known as first and second class. One of them gets \$100 a month and the other \$75 a month. We have ten regiments of cavalry. They are not all provided with veterinary surgeons. We have seven regiments of artillery which are not provided with veterinary surgeons.

This is a very small increase in a corps which is not enough now, and is a real saving to the Government. We would have made it more in the committee in this bill, but we have now pending before the committee a bill that deals with this question more in

detail. It is a matter of great importance to the Government to have the services of these men. It saves many times over their salaries; and if they can have the selecting of them, they ought to select these men from the modern school of veterinary, and thus obtain the services of men who have been thoroughly educated in that line. I hope the gentleman from Arkansas will see the necessity for this legislation. The Quartermaster's Department now employs veterinary surgeons, but it is not covered by this section.

* Mr. McRAE. I only make the point of order against the proviso. I am willing to give them the horse doctors, but I do not want to have this new legislation.

Mr. HULL. There is nothing in the law about where they shall be obtained from now.

Mr. HAY. What objection has the gentleman to having these people examined and the graduates from these schools being recognized?

Mr. McRAE. I think there are quite as good horse doctors who have never had anything to do with colleges.

Mr. HAY. There are many of these colleges in this country—one in almost every State.

Mr. McRAE. How many are there in Virginia?

Mr. HAY. Two, I believe; and there are two in the District of Columbia.

Mr. McRAE. It would be all very well for those States that have them, but there are just as good horse doctors outside of the colleges as in the colleges.

Mr. HAY. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. McRAE. The gentleman is very much mistaken about it.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the modern veterinary surgeon is an educated man. We have in a great many of the large principal cities very efficient schools for veterinary science; and if we are to have these men employed, let us at least get those who can bring to the service of the Army some amount of training. The Army has suffered in the past by having men who were simply farriers. When the last war was going on and we had a large number of horses at Tampa, on account of the lack of veterinary surgeons the Government practically lost several hundred horses.

Mr. MARSH. A thousand.

Mr. HULL. My friend says a thousand.

Mr. McRAE. Why did they not get good ones?

Mr. HULL. Because the Congress of the United States has never authorized us to deal with these men fairly, so that we could have them.

Mr. McRAE. What has the trouble been?

Mr. HULL. One has been the pay. You can not get a first-class veterinary who has had a large experience for \$75 a month.

Mr. McRAE. That is all you propose to give these men.

Mr. HULL. You can get the younger men for that amount; but you can not get the better qualified.

Mr. McRAE. That is all you propose to pay these.

Mr. HULL. We are taking a step further and giving them a greater privilege than we have before. We propose to increase the pay and to increase the qualifications as much as possible. If you strike out that provision as to the selection, the War Department might make regulations not to accept anybody who was not a graduate. But I think it is a good thing for this Congress to certify that hereafter we are going to get the very best talent we can to look after important interests of the Government.

Mr. McRAE. There are just as well-qualified horse doctors outside of the colleges as there are in them. We want to get good men, whether they are from colleges or not. So far as that is concerned, I will withdraw the point of order as against the number, making it as presented, and let the Department take the responsibility of getting them, and they can get the best men they can, but I will not consent to requiring them to be graduates.

Mr. HULL. Very well.

Mr. McRAE. I make the point of order against the two provisos.

Mr. HULL. I do not think the gentleman should do that. The last proviso only affects the clothing allowance.

Mr. McRAE. I am not familiar with military terms, and I do not know what the last proviso means.

Mr. HULL. It is simply an adjustment of the clothing account that the Government will furnish them. This settles with them monthly in cash and lets them buy their own clothing, instead of keeping a clothing account with them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What rank is given to these horse doctors?

Mr. HULL. No regular rank. It is a kind of mixed rank; a kind of noncommissioned officer and civilian employee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. When you give them this allowance you do not give them the rank of a sergeant-major?

Mr. HULL. Oh, no; they have no rank.

Mr. McRAE. I make the point of order as to the first proviso, and move to amend by striking out the word "further" in the second.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from Iowa to say that there is no existing statute for this?

Mr. HULL. "The gentleman from Iowa" does not contest the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. Without objection, the word "further," in line 4, will be stricken out. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

For pay of 90 paymasters' clerks, at \$1,400 each, \$123,000.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order for the purpose of making an inquiry. I would like to know something about the reason for this increase.

Mr. HULL. This includes the paymasters' clerks that are serving with what are called volunteer paymasters.

Mr. McRAE. But why the increase?

Mr. HULL. On account of having more paymasters than the regular establishment is provided for. Every paymaster is entitled to a clerk, and some have two.

Mr. McRAE. You only had seventy last year. How is that? This is an increase over last year.

Mr. HULL. This is the number that the War Department has certified that they have employed to meet the requirements of the service.

Mr. McRAE. Had they the authority to employ them?

Mr. HULL. I should say yes. In the last three months there have been 12 additional paymasters' clerks sent to the Philippines, and this simply appropriates for the number the Department has employed.

Mr. McRAE. It is in fact, then, an increase of twenty?

Mr. HULL. It is an increase over what we had last year.

Mr. McRAE. Well, I call the attention of the gentlemen on the other side to this; I do not care to insist upon it under all the circumstances, but it seems to be an unusually large increase in clerks to paymasters.

Mr. HULL. But there is an increased demand.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas does not insist on his point of order?

Mr. McRAE. No; I understand that they are already employed, and if so, they ought to be paid; and if necessary to the Pay Department, they should be employed.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

For pay of paymasters' messengers, \$10,000.

For traveling expenses of paymasters' clerks and expert accountant of the Inspector-General's Department, \$35,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make an inquiry of the chairman of the committee. Is there an expert now in the Inspector-General's Office?

Mr. HULL. Yes; there is.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

For additional pay to officer in charge of public buildings and grounds at Washington, D. C., \$1,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against that to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill why this increase?

Mr. HULL. I will say that this paragraph is not subject to a point of order. The existing law provides that whoever serves in the position of superintendent of public buildings and grounds shall have the pay, rank, and allowances of a colonel in the Regular Army. This appropriation is to make up the difference in pay in the Army proper and the position he is holding. If he was a colonel, there would be no need of the appropriation. If a captain, the difference in pay would have to be met by appropriation.

Mr. MAHON. Very well; I will withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

For travel allowance to enlisted men on discharge, \$3,000,000.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I am authorized by the Committee on Military Affairs to offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Strike out lines 1 and 2 on page 12 and insert the following:

"For traveling allowances to enlisted men and officers on discharge, \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That hereafter when an officer or an enlisted man is discharged from the service, except by way of punishment for an offense, he shall be allowed a commutation for traveling allowances of 4 cents per mile from the place of his discharge to the place of his residence at the time of his appointment, in the case of an officer, and to the place of his enlistment in the case of an enlisted man: *Provided, however*, That the Government may furnish both transportation and subsistence in kind for the whole or any part of the distance, and if it shall do so, no commutation shall be allowed for the portion of the distance so furnished: *Provided further*, That if transportation, without subsistence, be furnished in kind, the officer or enlisted man shall be allowed commutation for travel subsistence, of 2 cents per mile: *And provided further*, That transportation and subsistence shall be furnished in kind for all sea travel, when traveling to, from, and between our island possessions in the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, and no commutation shall be allowed therefor: *And provided further*, That in case an officer or enlisted man serving under an appointment accepted or enlistment made in the United States shall have been transported to any of our island possessions and there be discharged and reenlist, he shall, on final discharge from service,

be entitled to transportation and subsistence or commutation therefor, as above provided, from place of discharge to place of residence at time of appointment or place of last enlistment in the United States."

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order or reserve it?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make the point of order and not reserve it. I make the point of order that it is a change of existing law. If any gentleman desires to be heard upon it, I will for the time being withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the position taken by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Moody]. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserved the point of order to give the gentleman from Wisconsin an opportunity to say what he desired.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to say that the amendment does change existing law, and the point of order may be made. The existing law allows an officer or an enlisted man to commute his transportation and subsistence at the rate of one day for every 20 miles. That was a statute passed in 1812, when 20 miles was considered the ordinary day's travel, and it has existed upon the statute book from that day to this, and settlements made with honorably discharged men—enlisted men and officers—have been made on the basis of that antique statute.

In order that the House may understand how much this old statute means to the Government, I have secured a few statistics. For instance, if a captain be discharged in San Francisco and is sent home to Washington, that being the place where he received his appointment and commission, he would travel 3,147 miles. Under the old statute as it exists to-day he would be entitled to draw or commute for subsistence and for travel the amount of \$785. His railroad ticket from San Francisco to Washington would cost him only \$77.75.

In the case of a colonel, he could draw on discharge the amount of \$1,536; a brigadier-general, \$2,398; whereas the cost of a ticket to a brigadier-general is the same as to an enlisted man, namely, \$77.75. The amendment which I have offered is to the effect that his travel and his subsistence should be commuted at the rate of 4 cents a mile. Even at that rate he would be entitled to \$125.88; this amount less the cost of his ticket would leave a balance of \$48.13 to pay for his palace-car or chair-car privileges and pay for his meals.

The amendment further provides that the Government in all instances of sea travel shall furnish travel and subsistence in kind; and in case any person discharged in any of our island possessions reenlists, he shall not be entitled to his discharge money until his final discharge. There are many instances on record where an officer or enlisted man, discharged in those islands, has demanded his money to return and has then stayed in the islands. This amendment obviates that difficulty.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must sustain the point of order. The Clerk will continue reading the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

For interest on deposits and detained pay of enlisted men, including soldiers' deposits to be repaid, \$2,275,000.

Mr. HULL. I move to strike out, in the paragraph just read, the words "detained pay."

Mr. Chairman, there is at this time no such thing as detained pay, all of it having been returned. The language in the bill is the same that we have had in this bill for a great many years; but since the bill was reported, the War Department has informed us that, under a law passed by Congress some four years ago, all the detained pay has been returned; so that there is no longer any necessity for retaining these words in the appropriation bill. I therefore move to strike them out.

[Mr. RIDGELY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. HULL, it was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of a clerk attendant on the collection and classification of military information, \$1,500.

Mr. MAHON. Does this paragraph provide for a new clerk, or is this clerk now employed?

Mr. HULL. This provision is for a clerk that has been employed for years.

Mr. MAHON. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will continue the reading.

The Clerk read as follows:

For mileage to officers and contract surgeons, when traveling on duty under orders without troops, \$500,000: *Provided*, That officers so traveling shall be paid 7 cents per mile and no more; distances to be computed and mileage to be paid over the shortest usually traveled routes, with deduction as hereinafter provided for such portion of any route as may be over a subsidized railroad; and payment and settlement of mileage accounts of officers shall be made according to distances computed over routes established and

by mileage tables prepared by the Paymaster-General of the Army, under the direction of the Secretary of War.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph has been sufficiently read to disclose the fact that the whole paragraph is subject to the point of order which I now make.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the remainder of the paragraph, if it is not admitted.

The Clerk read as follows:

And all payments made by paymasters on account of mileage previous to the passage of this act shall be settled in accordance with distance tables officially promulgated and in use at date of payment: *Provided further*, That in cases of journeys of 1,000 miles and over officers who so desire may, upon application to the Quartermaster's Department, be furnished with transportation requests for the entire journey under their orders; and the cost of the through ticket obtained on such requests shall be a charge against the officer's mileage account, to be deducted by the paymaster paying the same and turned over monthly to an authorized officer of the Quartermaster's Department: *And provided further*, That actual expenses only shall be paid to officers for sea travel when traveling, as herein provided for, to, from, and between our island possessions in the Atlantic and Pacific oceans: *And provided further*, That when the established route of travel shall, in whole or in part, be over the line of any railroad on which the troops and supplies of the United States are entitled to be transported free of charge, or over any of the bond-aided Pacific railroads, or over the railroad of any railroad company which by law is entitled to receive only 50 per cent of the compensation earned by such company for transportation services rendered the United States, officers traveling as herein provided for shall, for the travel over the subsidized portion of such roads, be furnished with a transportation request by the Quartermaster's Department, and the cost of the transportation so furnished shall be a charge against the officer's mileage account for such travel, to be deducted by the paymaster who pays the account, at through rates as paid by the general public for travel over such roads.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, and I do it because the paragraph in several respects changes existing law.

In the first place, I call the attention of the Chair to line 14. The appropriation for mileage has heretofore invariably been—

For mileage to officers and contract surgeons "authorized by law."

The change here proposed is that mileage shall be paid—

When traveling on duty under orders without troops.

Obviously it would be within the power of any commanding officer who desired to do a favor to any of his subordinates to issue an order to him to travel to any part of the United States and the mileage would then be payable under this appropriation. Clearly that is a change of existing law.

The first part of the first proviso—

Officers traveling shall be paid 7 cents per mile and no more—is in effect existing law. The next part of it—

Distance is to be computed and mileage to be paid over the shortest usually traveled routes, with deductions—

And so forth—

and payment and settlement of mileage accounts of officers shall be made according to distances computed over routes established and by mileage tables prepared by the Paymaster-General of the Army, under the direction of the Secretary of War; and all payments made by paymasters on account of mileage previous to the passage of this act shall be settled in accordance with distance tables officially promulgated and in use at date of payment.

Upon that the gentleman from Iowa has new light since this bill was before the House last year, because when it was before the House last year it contained the same provision to which I have just now adverted. I will read the debate:

Mr. Dockery said:

I desire to reserve a point of order against the first proviso—

And then the following occurred:

Mr. HULL. There is no use in reserving it. I recognize that it is clearly subject to the point of order.

Mr. DOCKERY. I understand that, but I understand the chairman of the committee is willing in lieu of that proviso to insert the following:

"*Provided*, That hereafter the maximum sum to be allowed and paid to any officer of the Army shall be 7 cents per mile, the distance to be computed over the shortest usually traveled route."

Now, perhaps that would be sufficient authority, coming from the source whence it did come. I am now reading from the RECORD of February 27, 1899, and from page 2475. I now call the attention of the Chair to the fact that after a good deal of discussion a permanent law regulating mileage was agreed upon, and that law is set forth on the page of the RECORD to which I have referred. It was agreed upon, apparently, by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] and the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Dockery, and it settled the whole question of mileage, in these words:

Provided, That hereafter the maximum sum to be allowed and paid to any officer of the Army shall be 7 cents per mile, distances to be computed over the shortest usually traveled routes: *Provided further*, That when any officer so traveling shall travel in whole or in part on any railroad on which the troops and supplies of the United States are entitled to be transported free of charge, or over any of the bond-aided Pacific railroads, or over the railroad of any railroad company which is entitled to receive only 50 per cent of the compensation earned by such company for transportation services rendered to the United States, he shall be furnished with a transportation request by the Quartermaster's Department for such travel; and the cost of the transportation so furnished shall be a charge against the officer's mileage account for such travel, to be deducted by the paymaster who pays the account, at rates paid by the general public for travel over such roads: *Provided further*, That officers who, by reason of the decision of the accounting

officers of the Treasury, have been compelled to pay from their own means one-half of the cost of their travel fare over railroads known as 50-per-cent railroads shall be reimbursed the same by the Pay Department, and paymasters against whom disallowances have been made by the accounting officers of the Treasury under such decision shall have the amount so disallowed passed to their credit.

I call the attention of the Chairman to what is there stated, and I state that that purported to be a settlement of the whole law regarding the payment of mileage, and was accepted as a settlement at that time.

The provisions reported by the Committee on Military Affairs may be good ones. Very likely they would be provisions for which I should personally vote, after having heard the explanation of them, as I think I should have voted for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH], having heard his explanation.

But the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] on another part of the bill has very clearly pointed out the rule that should govern us. These appropriations in these general appropriation bills are for the purpose of carrying out existing law, and there ought not to be any changes in existing law unless they are so simple, so clear, and so necessary that everyone assents to them upon the very hearing of their provisions.

This is a very complicated matter. It changes the amount of travel pay to and from the new possessions of this country, because while the law that I have called the attention of the Chair to provided for the actual expenses to be paid to officers when traveling as herein provided for—"to and from" our island possessions—here it provides for payment for sea travel and payment while traveling "between" our island possessions.

That may be a change in the right direction. I do not say that it is not, but it is a change. If it were not a change, it would not be in this bill.

The provision giving the Secretary of War the right to compute mileage tables is a change of existing law, because the existing law is that they shall be paid 7 cents a mile computed over the "shortest usually traveled route."

It seems to me that these changes, however desirable they may be upon a full examination, upon a bill reported by the Committee on Military Affairs, are too great to pass upon a general appropriation bill. And I especially call the attention of the Chair and of the House to the fact that under this new provision in regard to mileage \$500,000 is put at the disposition of the commanding officers of the Army to be used possibly—I do not say that it will be so used—possibly for mere pleasure excursions. That ought not to be. No such change as that ought to be made without great deliberation and careful consideration.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, as to the first proposition of the gentleman from Massachusetts, in lines 13, 14, and part of 15, for mileage to officers and contract surgeons, the language used here and in the old bill means substantially the same thing, and the committee would have no objection whatever to either language being employed. The man who is ordered to go from one place to another is covered just as well by the words "authorized by law" as he is by the words "when traveling under orders without troops."

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Why was the change made?

Mr. HULL. Because the Book of Estimates submitted two propositions, two separate items for mileage, making up the total for \$500,000, one applying to the volunteers and the other to regulars. In one place the Department used the old language, and in the other they use language that meant the same thing—the language of the bill. I have no objection, and nobody could have any objection, to changing it to the words "when authorized by law," because the very minute an order is issued to an officer to go from here to San Francisco, from here to Chicago, or from here to New York, under the law he is compelled to go, and he is both acting under orders and it is authorized by law; so that that proposition, in my judgment, amounts to nothing.

Now, as to the other part, commencing with the proviso, the bill does not change the mileage. It still is 7 cents a mile. It does change the provision for arriving at the amount of compensation officers are to receive under the 7 cents a mile.

And I want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that this arrangement made last year with the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Dockery, is faulty in several particulars. It was intended in that amendment, as it was fixed up on the floor, that officers traveling to and from and between our island possessions should have only their actual expenses and no mileage; and yet it is so construed by the Treasury Department that an officer ordered from here to the Philippines must keep an account of his expenses from here until he reaches Manila, while an officer ordered from here to San Francisco and going with him on the same train gets his 7 cents a mile, showing that fixing it up on the floor defeated one of the very objects of the agreement.

Now, the position that I want to take in this, Mr. Chairman, is this: We can not change the compensation; we can not change the rate of 7 cents per mile on an appropriation bill if anyone raises a

point of order against it; but the details as to how this money shall be expended are a proper subject of legislation on an appropriation bill. The gentleman's Committee on Appropriations does it in almost every bill that they report here.

He says that he wants it considered by a committee. It has been considered by a committee. They were unanimous, so far as I now recall, in favor of this change. Take your mileage tables. That is the main contention of the gentleman, as I understand it. A paymaster goes from here to Manila. He is paying troops there. He is ordered by the Pay Department here to pay on a certain line. The accounts come back and go to the Treasury. They have not prepared distance tables there. They figure the distance as it comes up, as I understand it. The War Department has distance tables prepared.

The paymaster who refuses to pay on the order of the Secretary of War (because these orders come from him) would be liable to a court-martial. He has obeyed the orders of his superior officer, and he goes to the Treasury Department, and the Comptroller of the Treasury in this Administration makes one rule and under the next Administration they make another rule. His accounts are held up. The paymaster is constantly between two fires—one of a court-martial, the other of his accounts being held up.

One Department or the other of this Government ought to prepare mileage tables, and who so proper to do it as the War Department, issuing the orders and having the whole matter before them? For that reason I believe it is good legislation, and I believe the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Military Affairs, or any other committee of this House, can put restrictions and directions of how a fund shall be disbursed. They can not change the law as to the rate of compensation. They can not change the law providing for new and increased or reduced compensation; but they can, and in my judgment should, have the right, and ought to exercise it, of putting proper restrictions on these disbursements and report them to Congress.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. A single word in reply, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman yield to me for one minute? I want to say in the nine years I have already served on this committee in the annual appropriation bill I believe there has been a change in this provision in some form or other almost every year.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman allow me to speak before he positively makes the point of order?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. This matter came in this way, Mr. Chairman, before the committee. The Paymaster-General of the Army is known to all people to be a most careful man. When we came to this page of the bill, 17, the chairman of the committee said:

The CHAIRMAN. On page 17 there is nothing which I can see about which I wish to ask you.

General BATES. On page 17 there comes up the subject of mileage, which you have heard of before from time to time, and the question is as to exactly how you are going to arrange the mileage. I have some suggestions to make in regard to it.

This bill follows the wording of the last bill and the act making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, which gives the ordinary appropriation for mileage and which last year amounted to \$500,000. I want to suggest a change in the last lines of the bill, so that it will read "actual expenses shall be paid only to officers when traveling to and from our island possessions in the Atlantic and Pacific oceans." I would like to have that read "actual expenses only when traveling to, from, and between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans."

After discussing that he said this:

And then there is another subject of very great irritation and trouble during the last year between the Treasury and the pay departments in the matter of the statement of traveled distances. Congress some years ago enacted a law which prescribes that the Paymaster-General and the Secretary of War, through the Pay Department, shall issue from time to time official distance tables, which shall govern in all cases the distances of travel. With one exception, Congress has always worded that so that the distances shall be calculated by the shortest traveled route. One year it was left out, making it necessary for the men to go sometimes by an obsolete route, taking more time and expense than through the latest route, which might be a little longer. Congress has always put in "the usual traveled route," so that that puts the officers on the same basis as anyone else.

Last year the Auditor brought up that matter, and he discarded the use of the calculated distances by the shortest route. It came up in a question of the traveled distances down to Tampa from Atlanta. In going over that route the distance cut off, perhaps, 20 to 30 miles, and the account was held up.

I will not read the rest of it, but there was a change in the bill that was made last year.

Mr. HULL. I think it is all good reading.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I am afraid people do not care to listen to more.

Mr. HULL. It is a very important question.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey (reading):

Then, again, on these Pacific railroads there are land-grant and bond-aided roads, and upon those the Government has not been in the habit of allowing mileage. During this late war some of the other roads in those sections reduced their fare to that of the land-grant and bond-aided roads in order to get orders from the Government, and they accepted the same price as the bond-aided roads had been getting. Then the Comptroller put them in all exactly alike, as if they had worded the same; so they have all come in competition, and we had no means of knowing which was land-grant road and

which was not. When we calculated the distance, we took out the allowance from the agreement roads, whereas the officer had paid the rate of the usual traveled routes.

The question came up finally before the Auditor and Comptroller, and they agreed that they would not object to the distances as published and agreed that the accounts should be settled on that basis. I declined to get up new distance tables, stating that I thought it was not businesslike, and that it was not right to send such tables to officials who would be governed by them in good faith and who would have stoppages of their accounts. I can say that unless that wording is changed some of the Postmasters-General will be fleeced out of thousands of dollars.

Mr. PARKER. Have you wording to suggest?

General BATES. It is in this bill. The Quartermaster-General and myself recommend that we should go back again to the wording of the bill of 1878, and give the 4 cents mileage.

The CHAIRMAN. We fought for that a long time; but because the Paymaster-General and the Quartermaster-General were so insistent upon it the change was made.

General BATES. We find that it does not work well. An officer comes here, for instance, from San Diego, and by the wording of the law in settling with him we are obliged to take off a piece of travel over land-grant roads, and yet he may have paid the local rate of 4 or 5 cents. The distance from Kansas City to San Diego is 1,888 miles, and the Government pays out of that to these land-grant roads \$30, and the officer pays \$36.84. This is done because the Government gets through rates and the officer is charged local rates, so that he has to get off at the station and buy his ticket in the nearest local station. He does not actually get off, but we take it out in making the calculation.

The change that we make is, therefore, not a change of existing law, but is a change back. They tried to change the law. This is not a new law that is reported, but the old one from which a change was made last year, which did not work well, and which the Department reports does not work well. And it is suggested that we go back to the old law. Technically it may be a change of law, but to me it looks a return to the old law is not a change of law. I did not mean to tire the gentleman with so much reading. I suppose he may have read it.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The gentleman did not tire me at all. I was exceedingly interested in the remarks he made. I understood the gentleman from Iowa to say that this problem has been so perplexing that during his service in Congress he hardly remembers an appropriation bill in which some change of law has not been made. That indicates very clearly that the subject-matter is of such a character that it ought to be dealt with not upon a general appropriation bill, but upon a special bill reported to the House. I call the attention of the House specifically—

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Does it not answer that question to go back to the old law, which we had and worked fairly well, instead of keeping one which we know does not work well at all?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. It seems that while that law was in actual operation it was not deemed to be a satisfactory law either by the Department or by the Committee on Military Affairs. Now, if this measure were reported by a committee for whom we all have the respect that we have for the committee headed by the gentleman from Iowa, I believe it would meet with no opposition. Certainly my knowledge of the subject-matter would not permit me to oppose my views against the views of the committee.

But upon a complicated matter, where there have been changes from year to year of the law, and where it is still in an unsatisfactory condition, in the interest of the public service I submit that this point of order ought to be made and sustained, so that the Committee on Military Affairs will deal with this matter in a legislative bill and not an appropriation bill.

Mr. HULL. Before the gentleman takes his seat, I want to call his attention to an additional fact connected with this part of the bill, that the committee took it up after the hearing and adopted the section as it is in the bill. The Department then took it up and figured on it for some two weeks, and then submitted an amendment which goes to the whole section and changes it in a few words, so that it has been thoroughly considered.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Do I understand that an amendment or a substitute is to be offered?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. That shows the complexity of the subject. I intend to be fair about this, and I realize the difficulties that surround this great committee. I take it the present section will pass out of consideration, but I will say one word about it. The gentleman says there is no change in the law in regard to the provision which permits the establishment of distance tables officially promulgated. That was not his opinion last year, and I think is not the opinion of the Chair. I call the attention of the Chair to what the change of law would be. The existing law, because it was made permanent law by proviso last year, is that the mileage shall be paid on distances to be computed over the shortest usually traveled routes.

Now, when the gentleman from Iowa offered this provision in the House last year which he now offers it was pointed out that under the practice very often the official tables were not computed on the shortest usually traveled routes, and various instances were

pointed out in the debate in which apparently it was claimed that there had been some favoritism to particular railroads, and officers and men were sent over longer routes than those which were the usually traveled ones. The result of that debate was that this provision was agreed upon—that the mileage should be paid only over the shortest usually traveled route.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. The present law is the shortest traveled route, and the amendment inserts the word "usually" for the first time.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. There is no change in the law in that respect, and the law last year was the "shortest usually traveled route." Now it is proposed to go further and say that the mileage shall be settled "in accordance with distance tables officially promulgated and in use at the date of the payment." There is nothing that provides that the distance tables shall conform to the usually traveled route, and we get back to the same old evil which the law last year was intended to prevent. It seems to me that unless this was a change in existing law there would be no occasion to make it.

Last year we made a permanent law, perhaps for the first time. Now, they come in and ask a change; true, a change for only one year, but that is a change pro tanto—and I need not argue that to the present occupant of the chair—because they do not like to work under the old law.

Mr. HULL. If it will not interrupt the gentleman, I would like to ask the gentleman if the word "hereafter" does not apply only to the 7 cents a mile.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. It has not occurred to me so to read it; but I am not sure but that the gentleman from Iowa is right. It struck me that he was making the provisos all permanent law.

Now, if it is proposed to offer a substitute for this section I have this proposition to make, both to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] and to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER], that the substitute be offered, remain pending with the point of order until to-morrow, when we may have a chance to examine it. Then we will make the point of order on the substitute or not according to the result of that examination.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that this entire section be passed over until to-morrow, the point of order pending and the amendment pending.

Mr. HULL. If the Chair will permit me, I will send the amendment to the desk and have it inserted in the RECORD. I want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the amendment does not go to the first three lines of the section; it commences with the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the entire section be passed over with the point of order reserved against it and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa pending?

Mr. McRAE. And with the point of order reserved against the amendment.

Mr. HULL. With all points of order reserved.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendment is as follows:

That officers so traveling shall be paid 7 cents per mile and no more; distances to be computed and mileage to be paid over the shortest usually traveled routes, with deduction as hereinafter provided for such portion of any route as may be over a subsidized railroad; and payment and settlement of mileage accounts of officers shall be made according to distances computed over routes established and by mileage tables prepared by the Paymaster-General of the Army, under the direction of the Secretary of War; and all payments made by paymasters on account of mileage previous to the passage of this act shall be settled in accordance with distance tables officially promulgated and in use at date of payment: *Provided further*, That officers who so desire may, upon application to the Quartermaster's Department, be furnished with transportation requests for the entire journey under their orders; and the cost of the through ticket between the points traveled shall be a charge against the officer's mileage account, to be deducted by the paymaster paying the same and turned over to an authorized officer of the Quartermaster's Department: *And provided further*, That when the established route of travel shall, in whole or in part, be over the line of any railroad on which the troops and supplies of the United States are entitled to be transported free of charge, or over any of the bond-aided Pacific railroads, or over the railroad of any railroad company which by law is entitled to receive only 50 per cent of the compensation earned by such company for transportation services rendered the United States, officers traveling as herein provided for shall, for the travel over such roads, be furnished with transportation requests by the Quartermaster's Department, and the cost of the transportation so furnished shall be a charge against the officers' mileage accounts for such travel, to be deducted by the paymaster who pays the accounts, at through rates as paid by the general public for such travel as a part of the through journey under their orders: *And provided further*, That actual expenses only shall be paid to officers for sea travel when traveling, as herein provided for, to, from, or between our island possessions.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. There will be, I understand, no complications resulting from the amendment offered by the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HULL. Oh, no.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The complications which now exist result, as I understand, from the fact that there are really two mileage

tables—one in the War Department and another in the Comptroller's Office. The War Department insists upon the correctness of its mileage table; but when the paymasters' accounts are sent to the Comptroller he insists that his mileage table is correct. This condition of affairs produces endless confusion and annoyance to the paymasters.

Mr. HULL. In answer to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT], I will say that the gentleman has very properly indicated one cause of trouble. The officers are unfairly placed between two fires. So far as I am concerned, if the Treasury Department will promulgate mileage tables applicable to all cases where travel pay of officers is to be settled, I would rather it should do so than that we should have no accepted standard in these matters. This question ought to be settled under the law, so that officers and paymasters shall not, as now, be ground to powder between two different sets of regulations.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Is it not a fact that the mileage tables of the War Department are prepared by an officer who is recognized by nearly everyone connected with the Government as an expert, and are they not prepared with a view to selecting the usual and most traveled route?

Mr. HULL. Oh, yes; the law provides that that shall be done.

Mr. RIDGELY. I would like to have indicated, by pages and lines, the part of the bill which we are passing over.

The CHAIRMAN. The portion of the bill passed over begins at page 12, line 13, and extends to page 14, line 4, inclusive.

The Clerk read as follows:

For additional 20 per cent increase on pay of enlisted men, \$1,524,715: *Provided*, That hereafter the pay of all officers and enlisted men serving beyond the limits of the United States in the islands in possession or under the control of the United States, and in the Territory of Alaska, shall be increased 10 per cent for officers and 20 per cent for enlisted men over and above the rates of pay as fixed by law in time of peace.

Mr. HAY. I rise to make a point of order.

Mr. McRAE. I desire to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] is recognized.

Mr. HAY. I desire to make a point of order, but I will reserve it, and ask that the Clerk may read an amendment I have prepared. If this amendment be accepted, I will withhold or withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the Clerk will read the proposed amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 13, page 14, strike out "beyond the limits of the United States in the islands in the possession or under the control of the United States" and insert "in Puerto Rico, Cuba, the Philippine Islands, Hawaii."

Mr. HULL. We have no objection to that.

Mr. McRAE. I made a point of order against the paragraph, which I will insist upon unless the paragraph can be further amended.

Mr. HAY. I will withdraw the point of order I made, if there be no objection.

Mr. McRAE. I insist on the point of order I made.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas renews the point of order.

Mr. HULL. If the point of order is renewed and sustained, there is really no object whatever in the appropriation. The law provides that this 20 per cent additional shall be allowed only in time of war, and in my judgment there can be no disputing the fact that we are not now in a condition of war which justifies the payment of this sum of money. I repeat, that if the point of order against the proviso be insisted upon, there can be no reason for the appropriation.

Mr. McRAE. If the gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the committee, will accept the amendment which I propose to offer, I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. HULL. I would like to hear the amendment before I agree to the gentleman's proposition.

Mr. McRAE. My amendment proposes to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That enlisted men receiving or entitled to the 20 per cent increased pay herein authorized shall not be entitled to or receive any additional compensation for what is known as extra or special duty.

Mr. HULL. I will accept that, of course, because the original law contains exactly that provision.

Mr. McRAE. If the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia and this amendment are accepted, I will withdraw the point of order. I think, however, the gentleman from Iowa is mistaken in his statement in regard to the original law.

Mr. RIDGELY. I wish to reserve my right to renew the point of order.

Mr. McRAE. The gentleman will find in the course of a few months that what I say is true. These men who are now getting an additional 20 per cent will have a right, if they have done work for which they are entitled to extra pay, to enforce their claim against the Government.

Mr. HULL. The original law provided that while they received

this 20 per cent there should be no extra pay allowed to them. If the gentleman will look back at the law he will find that it makes this matter very clear, so that they can not have their pay enlarged in the way he has indicated. I have no objection whatever to the amendment.

Mr. McRAE. I should like to have the paragraph as amended read.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands, the gentleman from Arkansas withdraws his point of order and offers an amendment.

Mr. McRAE. I think that with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia and myself the provision will be satisfactory to me, but I want it read.

Mr. HULL. Let the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] offer his amendment first.

Mr. HAY. I did offer mine.

The CHAIRMAN. The points of order are withdrawn by both the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Arkansas. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment, to which the gentleman from Arkansas moves his amendment as an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. HULL. The amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas comes in at the close of the paragraph, does it not, as an additional proviso?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will first report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HULL. That is right.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 13, page 14, strike out the words "beyond the limits of the United States, in the islands in possession or under the control of the United States," and insert the words "Puerto Rico, Cuba, the Philippine Islands, Hawaii."

Mr. HULL. I accept that amendment, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, it must be obvious that the very large amount of money carried in this bill is due in large measure to our occupation of the Philippine Islands. The demands of the service in those islands require the presence of at least 65,000 men, and even with that number we can not properly garrison and effectively hold the towns and villages which we are constantly capturing and as constantly abandoning. The subjugation of these people by military force will be found an endless task. Such, at least, has been the experience of this Government during the last year. We must, of course, appropriate the necessary money to pay, feed, and clothe the Army, which has been created by law and which is obeying the orders of this Government.

The problem which confronts us is, How can we dispense with this great army; how can we relieve the people of this country of the enormous burden of taxation which the present policy of this Administration entails upon them? We can only do this by a declaration of a policy which will rid the Philippine Islanders of the fear that we are seeking to deprive them of their liberties. The Republican party is in power; upon them rests the responsibility of pacifying these islands. It is the duty of that party to acquaint the country with their purposes and intentions toward these islands and their inhabitants.

But this great party, intrusted by the people with the destinies of the United States, is either afraid to avow its policy or it is incapable of dealing with the momentous questions which now confront us. That party is drifting. It is not willing to father any policy other than one of mysterious silence. That party, seeing the tremendous sentiment in this country for the Boers fighting for their liberties, is afraid to avow its purpose of stifling liberty in the Philippines, while it yet permits its Administration to carry out in the Philippines the same policy which the people of the United States condemn in South Africa.

Two alternatives present themselves. We must either determine to hold these islands as permanent possessions, or we must decide not to hold them. We can not hold them permanently unless we incorporate them as part of this country. To do this would be against the interests of all the people of the United States. I state it as an incontrovertible principle that the United States can not govern the Philippine Islands as a colony, separate and distinct from this country, without violating the Constitution of the United States. Such a mode of government was never contemplated by the founders of this Government, and is against the genius, the traditions, and history of this country; and no circumstances now exist to warrant us in departing from fundamental principles. The doctrine of a "higher law," even if such a doctrine were to be tolerated or could be justified, is not applicable in this case.

The only form of government which can be administered under the Constitution of the United States in the Philippines is the Territorial form of government, having for its ultimate object the admission of that Territory into the American Union as a State. No man, I care not what his politics may be, is willing to advocate the admission of the Philippine Islands as a State of this Union;

nor is anyone willing even to make them a Territory, giving to them, as we would have to do, all the rights, privileges, and immunities enjoyed by the people of the United States.

As we can not, consistently with the interests of this country, govern these islands as a colony, nor as a Territory, nor as a State, we must meet the issue which faces us by the declaration of a policy which will tend to an immediate pacification of these islands and which will restore to the inhabitants thereof their confidence in us as a people who have in the past gained their own liberty and who have encouraged other peoples, by our sympathy and by our actions, to establish freedom in their own countries.

We should first restore peace and order in the Philippine Islands; we should put down every semblance of opposition to this Government, which, unfortunately, has so dealt with these people as to make them look upon us rather as oppressors than as liberators. As soon as this task is accomplished we should establish in the Philippine Islands, at the earliest practicable moment, a free and independent government for the inhabitants of these islands, reserving for ourselves such commercial rights and privileges and retaining such trade and coaling stations as may be deemed necessary for the purposes of the trade and commerce of the United States with the Orient.

If we pursue this course we will be true to the principles of liberty, and we will gain every advantage which, in any event, we can hope to obtain for the expansion of our trade and commerce. The conditions in the Philippines are such that only the strong hand of power can restore peace and order and establish for them a free government; and having put our hand to the task, we must not draw back until we have accomplished it. As soon as this country announces that freedom shall be given to the people of the Philippines, just so soon will those people begin to trust us and to cease their opposition. They will lay down their arms and hasten to assist us to accomplish our purpose, which will be their freedom.

This policy must be announced in no uncertain terms, and must be carried out in good faith and with unfaltering resolution. When it is announced and inaugurated we will begin to see the end of imperialism. Such a policy will sound the death knell to militarism. The enormous expenditures for the Army, for the Navy, for fortifications, can be done away with, and the people of the United States can see an end to the vast burden of taxation which they now bear. The policy which is outlined here is practicable, is wise, and is consonant with our Constitution, with our traditions, with our history, and with our duty to ourselves and to the world.

To govern the Philippine Islands as a colony and to hold them permanently, besides being as such unconstitutional, will be of no advantage to any class of citizens in the United States. The agriculturist, the laboring man, and the business man can derive no benefit from such a policy. In the first place, such a government means the continuation and increase of the large expenditure now necessary. The Army and Navy must be increased. Vast sums must be expended for fortifications on these islands. A very large standing army is inevitable if this policy is pursued.

It is not conceivable that we can continue the present system of volunteer enlistments of two years; it is too expensive, too cumbersome, and practically requires us to equip and discipline an army every two years; the only alternative is the maintenance of a great military establishment, which, once fastened upon us, it will be next to impossible to dislodge. The experience of the last year teaches us that less than 65,000 men in the Philippines can accomplish but little, and the problem presents itself, how can we before July, 1901, when the present 35,000 volunteers must be mustered out by law, bring into subjugation the inhabitants of these islands so that they can be governed without the use of this immense military establishment, costing over \$100,000,000 annually?

Added to the military establishment is the naval establishment. The possession of these islands and their permanent retention make it absolutely necessary that we should protect them from all outside interference. To do this we must have a naval force capable of meeting, and meeting successfully, the naval force of any country which might by possibility come against us. We must build ship for ship with every great maritime power of the world and build many ships before we can be classed with England and France as a sea power. In this Congress the naval appropriation bill carries about \$70,000,000, and we must look to see these appropriations increased from year to year.

Again, we must erect fortifications on every island which we intend to hold. The cost of this can not be computed; but it would run into the hundreds of millions. A moderate estimate would be that the government of these islands as a colony would cost this country annually \$400,000,000. What material benefits, then, can we derive from the permanent retention of these islands? What can the farmers and laborers of this country expect in return for the taxes which they must pay to keep up the Army and Navy which will be necessary to hold them? In acquiring them

you acquire a country which will compete in the markets of the world with the cotton growers of the South, with the wheat raisers throughout this country, with those who grow corn and rice, and with almost every agricultural product of the United States.

The labor of this country will have to compete with the cheapest labor on the globe, with Chinese, Japanese, and Malay labor. These islands present no field of enterprise to our young men. Opportunities in the United States have not been exhausted. This country to-day presents the widest field for business and enterprise of any other in the world.

Commerce can find its outlet and advantage to the countries in the East in the manner which I have indicated, by our reserving such commercial rights and privileges and retaining such trade and coaling stations as may be necessary for the purposes of our trade in the Orient. Let us briefly examine the geography, the resources, the trade and commerce, the climate and situation of these islands, so that we may determine what material advantages they have for us.

TOPOGRAPHY, ETC.

The Philippine Islands number, by various estimates, from 1,000 to 2,000.

Luzon, the largest, has an area of about 41,000 square miles; Mindanao, the next, about 37,500 square miles; the five next in size, about 10,000 square miles each.

The aggregate land area of the group, about 114,356 square miles, the entire land and water being about 1,000 miles long and 600 wide.

The contour consists mainly of mountains and intervening valleys, with some plains of limited area.

The climate ranges from 80° to 100° in the hottest season to 60° in the coolest.

The seasons are classed as wet and dry. The Spanish tersely describe them as "six months of mud, six months of dust, and six months of everything," including, of course, gales, typhoons, and occasional earthquakes.

The following is from the Military Notes on the Philippines, No. 20, September, 1898, War Department (page 20):

Spanish statistics are notoriously unreliable, and no accurate census has ever been taken, but the population has been estimated at about 8,000,000, of which the bulk is of Malay origin. On first arrival the Spaniards found a part of the natives somewhat civilized; but while they had a written language, of which some specimens have been preserved, it was of no value in throwing light upon their early history, and their traditions are very few. As in Mexico and Central America, the Spanish priests have been only too successful in their effort to extirpate all mythological and other lore. The treatment of the inhabitants has been more merciful, however, than in the western possessions.

The Philippine Malays are a superior race to many other Asiatic peoples. Orderly, amiable, courteous, honest, and exceedingly superstitious, they are easily influenced upon profession of Christianity. Like most tropical people, their efforts are intermittent rather than steady; their wants are readily provided for, and they take life easy. The inhabitants of the island are composed of the most diverse mixtures of races, including Malays, Aetas, Negritos, pure blacks, Chinese, Japanese, Indians, Moors, Europeans, and mixtures of each with the others.

There are nearly as many different tribes as there are islands, and it is said that 500 languages and dialects are spoken in the islands at the present day. The inhabitants are generally tractable and amenable to government, and generally not hostile to foreigners. In the inaccessible parts of the island there are still tribes of unsubdued savages, whose number is estimated at about 602,000. Fond of music, dancing, and amusements of all kinds, they are born gamblers, and cock-fighting is their greatest passion. Every town has its cockpit, and in the largest the spectators may be numbered by thousands.

This amusement was heavily taxed by the Spaniards, and advantage is taken of the taste for gambling by running a lottery for the benefit of the Government.

Probably not more than fifteen or twenty thousand Spaniards, or people of pure Spanish blood, are permanent residents, and the number of other foreigners is not large. The majority of these are at Manila, where the English have established a club in the suburbs, which has become the center of foreign social intercourse. (Military Notes on the Philippines, page 24.)

The principal staples of export are tobacco (manufactured and raw), manila hemp, sugar cane, coffee, and cocoa. The principal manufactures consist of a variety of textile fabrics, hats, mats, baskets, ropes, furniture, coarse pottery, carriages, and musical instruments.

EXTRACTS FROM THE CONSULAR REPORTS (JUNE, 1898).

During the quarter ending December 31, 1897, there were exported from these islands to the United States and Great Britain 216,898 bales of hemp (280 pounds per bale), of which 138,792 bales went to the United States and 78,106 bales went to Great Britain. During the year 1897 there was an increase in the export of hemp from the Philippines to continental Europe of 19,741 bales; to Australia, 2,192 bales; to China, 28 bales; to Japan, 2,628 bales, and to the United States, 133,896 bales, a total increase of 153,485 bales; while to Great Britain there was a decrease of 22,348 bales. Thus, of increased shipments from the Philippines, those to the United States were 544 per cent greater than to all other countries combined. Of the total exports of hemp from the Philippines for the ten years ended 1897, amounting to 6,528,965 bales (914,055 tons), 41 per cent went to the United States.

During the same years the Philippine Islands exported to the United States and to Europe 1,582,904 tons of sugar, of which 875,150 tons went to the United States, 666,391 tons to Great Britain, and 41,362 tons to continental Europe, showing that of the total exports more than 55 per cent went to the United States. At the current values in New York of hemp (4 cents per pound) and of raw sugar (31 cents per pound) the exports of these two products alone from these islands to the United States during the ten years under review amounted to \$89,253,722.80, or an average of nearly \$8,925,372 per year.

Data as to cigars, tobacco, copra, woods, hides, shells, indigo, coffee, etc.,

are not now obtainable, but a conservative estimate would so raise the above figures as to show United States imports from these islands to average about \$1,000,000 per month. To-day there are authentic invoices for export to the United States amounting to \$138,066.12.

IMPORTS.

The following statement of the general trade of the Philippine Islands is taken from the Review of the World's Commerce, 1896-97, soon to be published by the Bureau of Foreign Commerce. According to a British foreign office report (No. 1932, annual series, 1897), the total imports into the island in 1896 were valued at \$10,631,250, and the exports at \$20,175,000. The trade with several of the most important countries, compiled from the respective official statistics, was:

Country.	Imports.	Exports.
Great Britain.....	\$2,467,090	\$7,467,500
Germany.....	744,928	233,700
France.....	1,794,900	1,987,900
Belgium.....	272,240	45,660
United States.....	162,446	4,982,857
China.....	103,680	13,770
Japan*.....	98,782	1,987,909

* In 1897.

The chief imports are rice, flour, dress goods, wines, coal, and petroleum.

Agriculture is not yet developed, although the soil is very fertile. The people are skillful weavers of cotton and silk; they can tan leather; excel in shipbuilding, and make good wagons and carts. In Consular Reports (June, 1899, page 296) Consul Williams writes:

The Philippines produce a good quantity of woven stuff. Probably the greater part is made of imported cotton yarn, gray, white, and dyed; but there are also many thousands of pieces made of manila hemp, in ordinary and in fine qualities, the latter very often mixed with silk.

The principal places for the manufacture of cotton goods are the two provinces of Ilocos, in the north of Luzon, and for hemp the provinces of Albay and Camarines. The Visayas provinces manufacture all the different woven stuffs.

From Consular Reports (December, 1898, page 559) Consul Morris reports:

As all details relative to the Philippine Islands are at present of importance, I have thought that the free translation of a recent report made by the Belgian consul at Manila upon the export trade of those islands during 1897 may not be without interest. This report bears date April 21, 1898.

The Belgian consul maintains that during 1897 statistics show a great increase in the export trade, notwithstanding the continuance of the rebellion. The export of abaca, or manila hemp, increased by 314,284 piculs (43,816,906 pounds). Copra likewise was exported to the amount of 200,000 piculs (27,890,000 pounds) more than in 1896. The exportation of this product began only in 1892. Prior to that time almost all the copra came from the Caroline Islands. To-day all the islands of the archipelago produce it. Exports of dyewoods, coffee, indigo, mother-of-pearl, gums, tobacco, leather, and hemp rope also considerably increased.

The following table shows the total export trade of abaca from the Philippine Islands during the past ten years:

Year.	Quantity exported.	Year.	Quantity exported.
	Pounds.		Pounds.
1888.....	184,472,548	1893.....	178,906,261
1889.....	158,374,451	1894.....	221,999,100
1890.....	141,166,629	1895.....	229,338,075
1891.....	177,254,058	1896.....	213,601,979
1892.....	220,472,681	1897.....	251,648,123

Exports of sugar by Manila show a decrease of 656,426 piculs (91,899,640 pounds) for 1897 as compared with 1896.

At Cebu, on the contrary, the export trade of sugar increased. Both in the Visayas and Negros Islands the production of sugar greatly developed. During the last ten years the quantity of sugar exported from the Philippine Islands has been as follows:

Year.	Quantity exported.	Year.	Quantity exported.
	Pounds.		Pounds.
1888.....	414,988,800	1893.....	585,801,440
1889.....	490,377,680	1894.....	435,275,120
1890.....	290,459,080	1895.....	517,267,660
1891.....	373,767,400	1896.....	515,006,520
1892.....	553,148,400	1897.....	452,687,620

The exports of dyewoods from Manila, entirely for China and Japan, amounted in 1897 to 9,167,900 pounds, as compared with 7,838,600 pounds in 1896.

The exportation of cigars fell from 194,136,000 in 1896 to 169,465,000 in 1897. The export trade of 1897 was distributed as follows:

To—	Number.	To—	Number.
United States and Canada:		England.....	24,290,000
Atlantic ports.....	2,460,000	Australia.....	16,300,000
Pacific ports.....	183,000	Singapore and India.....	37,310,000
Continental Europe.....	30,500,000	China and Japan.....	58,420,000

Of leather for glue, there were exported, in 1897, 112,000 pounds for the United States and Canada, 77,150 pounds for Singapore and India, and 99,450 pounds for China and Japan.

GHENT, September 17, 1898.

HENRY C. MORRIS, Consul.

From Consular Reports, November, 1898 (page 446), Consul Frankenthal reports:

From an interview with a merchant of Manila, I am enabled to give the exporters of the United States certain points which may be of value to business men who intend to enter the field there.

The Philippines contain over 7,000,000 inhabitants. The Chinese, who are in the majority among the aliens, control the retail trade, while next to them come the Spanish dealers. It is estimated that there are about 300 other Europeans in business in the whole group. The richest dealers are the creoles and mestizos, a combination of Chinese and Tagalese.

In Manila there are many large cigarette factories, some of which employ as many as 4,000 hands. A few German, Swiss, and English firms have entered that field. There is also a sugar refinery, a steam rice mill, a Spanish electrical plant, a Spanish telephone exchange, a Spanish tramway, worked partly by steam and partly by horsepower; rope factories, worked mainly by hand (a few use oxen); a Spanish brewery, which furnishes a good beer; a German cement factory, with 70 hands; a Swiss umbrella factory, and a Swiss hat factory, which makes felt and straw articles, the latter out of Chinese straw braid. A cotton mill with 6,000 spindles and with capital (English) of £40,000 (\$194,600) is in process of erection.

The European firms in Manila are divided as follows: Forty-five Spanish, 19 German, 17 English, 2 English and 6 Swiss brokers, 2 French storekeepers with large establishments, 1 Dutch, and 1 Belgian. Small retail stores (40 in number) are kept by Chinese firms. The German and Swiss firms are general importers, while the export of hemp and sugar, the import of domestic dry goods, and the ship-chandlery trade are in the hands of the English.

Credit from one to three months and 5 per cent is given, while spot-cash sales command a discount of 7 per cent. Caution is advised in dealing with the Chinese merchants, as Manila has no mercantile register like Hongkong.

Cotton yarns are a heavy import article, so far mainly from Barcelona, by reason of the minimum Spanish tariff. The Spanish manufacturers have done what England, Germany, and Switzerland have always refused to do, and that is to number the yarns. In Manila No. 10 is sold numbered 24; No. 16, numbered 30; No. 18, numbered 32; No. 22, numbered 40; No. 24, numbered 50, and No. 36 or 40, numbered 60. The orders given are for four-fifths unbleached and one-fifth bleached.

Dyed yarn is bought in Nos. 20 and 32, in colors of orange, green, and rose. Turkey-red yarn, in the correct Nos. 20 to 40, especially 32, used to come from Elberfeld, but of late years Spain has managed to supply it. Bleached and unbleached shirtings and drills, from Manchester, are sold in large quantities, but of late the pieces have decreased in yards as well as in widths. The staples now are white shirtings, 26 inches wide and 36 yards long; gray T cloth, 25 inches wide and 24 yards long; gray long cloth, 28 inches wide and 32 yards long; and gray drills, 25 inches wide and 27 yards long.

Colored prints, 24 inches wide, with red ground and fancy crimps, are good sellers. Gingham and chellass, for bed coverings, etc., common quality, in large patterns with red ground, some with yellow or blue squares, some with indigo ground, and a few in green, in pieces of 24 yards, find a good market, while cotton cassinette, in light weight and double width, for trousers, is in demand. Handkerchiefs, 17 by 18 inches and 22 by 22 inches, white, or white with colored borders, are the correct thing. Black cotton zaneilas, 18 inches wide, for the dresses of the country women, and aniline black satins, in 45-inch goods, are considered stylish.

Woven cotton underwear is a great staple, and white cotton bed quilts, in fancy patterns, are used as ponchos, after a hole has been cut in the center. It is estimated by my informant that 500,000 dozen undershirts are used annually—two-thirds with arms half-length, sizes 34 to 40, 27 inches long, bleached white, striped, printed, and network. Men's cotton socks, 9 to 11, and ladies' cotton hose, 8 to 9, are the right sizes. Cheap cotton lace *pinta fichus* are worn by all the women.

Other articles which have a good sale are low-priced sewing machines, carriages and parts, enameled ware for cooking utensils, and, last but not least, American clocks, which now have a good foothold and for which there is an increasing demand.

BERNE, September 16, 1898.

ADOLPH L. FRANKENTHAL, Consul.

(Consular Reports, October, 1898, pages 313-315.)

FOREIGN REPORTS AND PUBLICATIONS—COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL CONDITIONS IN THE PHILIPPINES.

The following extracts are from the Bulletin de la Société de Géographie Commerciale, Paris, Volume XIX, No. 4. Speaking of the market for European goods, the writer says:

French canned goods, while appreciated for their good qualities, are undersold by English and Spanish articles. The Germans sell only canned vegetables. A Swiss establishment has recently begun selling *pâtés de foie gras*, sauerkraut, and preserved vegetables. Australia is now sending large quantities of butter and meat. Wine and whisky do not sell readily, on account of the competition of local manufacturers.

There is a good market for jewelry, especially in the provinces, in inexpensive articles. The French have a good place in this line, although the Germans and Swiss are competing seriously. American watches and jewelry in white metal are also becoming known. The profits in this branch are enormous. Watch pins, bought in Europe at 7 francs (\$1.35) per dozen, sell here at \$3, Mexican (\$1.33), apiece. The same is true of many other articles.

Textiles of cotton, silk, linen, etc., would find an important market here if they were adapted to the taste of the millions of inhabitants of these islands.

Shoes are an important item of importation. They represent over 1,500,000 francs (\$289,500) annually, and come chiefly from Austria, Germany, and (since 1895) from Spain. All articles pertaining to carriages are well received. Chromos, engravings, religious objects, etc., have a large sale among the Indians and half-breeds.

The glassware sold at Manila is mostly of the most ordinary class, and is supplied by England, Germany, and China. French perfumery and drugs are sold universally. Olive oil comes from Spain, and dried fruits, which are largely consumed, are sent by Spain, Italy, and China.

Besides the above-mentioned articles, England, Germany, and Belgium export to the Philippines a considerable quantity of iron, zinc (worked and unworked), machines of all sorts, and firearms, as well as hardware, nails, and other small articles of iron, which sell at remunerative prices.

In regard to the resources of the islands the article continues:

The land is wonderfully productive, but lacks intelligent cultivation. So wasteful have been the methods that, in spite of the wonderful fertility of the soil, the harvests have in some places diminished. This is true of maize in the island of Cebu and of sugar cane in the province of Pangasinan, where

new plantations must now be made every year, while at Negros the land yields many times in succession. The rice production, formerly so large, has so fallen off that importations have been found necessary.

To give an idea of what the archipelago has suffered in this respect from the negligence of its inhabitants, the following table, showing the imports of rice into the Philippines for a certain number of years, has been compiled:

1881	12,233,166
1882	20,751,104
1883	119,865,863
1890	157,157,763
1891	160,195,654
1892	138,247,863

There are two kinds of rice in the islands—hill rice and plain rice—although these two varieties might be infinitely subdivided according to quality, shape, size, etc. This is the principal food of man and animals. Very little work is necessary in its cultivation, and it is astonishing that the natives have not produced larger quantities instead of deriving their supplies from Japan and China. The method of cultivation is as follows: At the end of April the ground is worked and divided into large squares. One of these is used as a seed plot, and the work is continued on the others.

After three or four days the ground is harrowed and the seed, after being soaked in water for at least two hours, is planted. The ground must not be allowed to become too dry or too wet in the interval before transplanting, which usually takes place in June when the plants are from 4 to 7 inches high. Women and children then carefully lift the young plants and carry them to adjacent squares similarly prepared, where other women place them in rows about 8 inches apart. During the period of growth each square is left open in order that the water may freely enter, and it is only when the plant becomes yellow that the ground is allowed to dry. The plants are again watered and are gathered by men by means of primitive sickles.

The production of cotton is also diminishing, for the same reasons that apply to rice. It grows in the provinces of north and south Ilocos, Union, Abra, and Pangasinan. The kinds cultivated are *Gossypium herbaceum* and *Bomba pentandrum*. The ground is almost never prepared, and the cotton is silky in quality and would easily become a valuable product if attention were given to the cultivation.

In the two provinces of Ilocos too great humidity is not to be feared for this plant, for theseason of rain is well defined here, from June until October, and the land is adapted to its cultivation. Nevertheless, the indolence of the Indians has caused cotton to take an inferior rank among the products of the colony.

Hemp is the most important product, and is obtained from the trunk of a species of banana tree, the fruit of which is not comestible. The tree, which attains a height of from 22 to 26 feet, is cultivated in the following manner:

The ground is worked carefully, the best period being from June to October; it is well irrigated and divided into squares of about 13 feet. Earth that has clay on the surface and limestone below is well adapted for the purpose. The seeds are planted two and two in little holes 5 to 7 inches apart and covered with earth and straw, the latter being set on fire to aid in the germination. The ground is irrigated before sunrise for several days, and care is taken to destroy all insects.

When the plants are about the size of three fingers they are transplanted. The sprouts during the heat of the day, i. e., from 10 to 3 o'clock, are sheltered from the rays of the sun. After the third year the plants yield every eight months. Some producers plant sweet potatoes between the rows of bananas. This vegetable is largely consumed in the islands, and its roots destroy the weeds that grow so rapidly in these climates. The potatoes, however, must be protected against the boars, which are very fond of this vegetable.

The production of sugar is gradually developing. When the cultivation of this product was begun, elevated lands were chosen, not only to avoid the excess of humidity, but also because the low-lying land was occupied with rice and maize. The sugar plantations were established on the hills, which necessitated additional labor and longer transportation. Rats have caused serious damage, and the lack of labor and of capital has been an additional obstacle to the progress of the industry.

Sugar is planted in March and April in order to have the cane of good size by the rainy season. Two sorts are found in the Philippines, one of green and the other of reddish color. The product goes to Japan, England, and the United States. The price is very low. The principal centers of production are the provinces of Batangas, Pampanga, Ilocos, Pangasinan, and Bulacan; also Iloilo and the islands of Cebu and Negros.

Tobacco alone would make a fortune for the Philippines, although it must be admitted that the quality has deteriorated of late years on account of the lack of good management. A large number of companies have been formed for the exploitation of this industry. The two most important are the "Compagnie Generale des Tabacs des Philippines," the capital of which (\$14,500,000 gold) is principally in the hands of French bondholders, and the "Insular." Each of these establishments employs from 5,000 to 6,000 workmen.

The native coffee has a fine aroma. It grows in the provinces of Batangas, Cavite, and Zamboanga, and is exported chiefly to Spain. The coconut tree grows abundantly and seems made to order for these countries, where the people are averse to exertion. Coconut oil is used for lighting the houses and streets of certain provinces, where electricity or petroleum are as yet unknown.

The native indigo is famous for its excellent quality. Several years ago the provinces of Ilocos, Pangasinan, Pampanga, and Camarines produced enormously. Unfortunately, the faulty preparation and the adulteration on the part of the Chinese traders to which the powder was subjected have greatly reduced its market value. It is exported chiefly to Japan.

Cavao is produced in the provinces of Leyte, Bohol, Misamis, Cebu, Negros, and Samar; that of Cebu and Negros, especially, can rival the best of America. On account of the laziness of the Indians, all the product is locally consumed.

A species of dyewood, which resembles logwood and is called sibaao, is produced in the country and exported to England and China. Among the other products of the country are ihlang-ihlang, wax, mother-of-pearl, straw hats, rattan, etc. These have, however, a secondary importance.

Besides the numerous tobacco establishments, to which reference has already been made, there are in Manila rice factories, sugar mills, distilleries, factories of cord, carriages, soap, aerated waters, brickyards, sawmills, printing establishments, as well as repair shops. Chinese houses where cheap furniture, shoes, etc., are made, and the numerous little industries which belong to a city. The purely native industries consist of work in bamboo and cotton, engraving, and making straw hats. The women have long and slender fingers, fine and sensitive, and the hats and cigarette holders they make, their work on pineapple cloth, and the articles they embroider, are models of delicacy.

The manufacture of cotton goods often forms the occupation of an entire village, and the industry is far from being of insignificant proportions. Artificial incubation, however, is perhaps the industry most peculiar to the Philippines. The apathy of the natives adapts them to this occupation, in which, however, only those who are old and crippled are employed. They lie on

soft beds, the eggs being placed around their bodies, and maintain this position until the eggs are hatched. Ducks are raised in large quantities.

As to the imports and exports earlier, the following estimate is given in Consular Reports, July, 1898, page 423:

In 1891 the Philippine exports to Spain amounted to \$22,479,000 (\$18,095,595). In 1891 the Philippine imports from Spain amounted to \$17,126,000 (\$13,786,430).

The total exports from the Philippines in 1892 consisted of 95,016 tons of hemp; 3,951,060 piculs (553,148,400 pounds) of sugar; 21,223 piculs (2,971,220 pounds) of coffee; 61,459 piculs (8,604,260 pounds) of sampan wood; 5,550 piculs (779,800 pounds) of indigo; 254,428 quintals (56,091,197 pounds) of tobacco leaf; 137,059,000 cigars. The total exports in 1892 were of the value of \$53,479,000 (\$23,803,569).

Total value of imports in 1892 were of the value of \$27,000,000 (\$19,197,000). Manila hemp is the fiber of a species of banana (*Musa textilis*) which thrives only in certain localities, where it is cultivated by the natives. The fiber is still produced in the old way, by scraping the leaves with a peculiar knife, which requires expert handling. Numberless contrivances to supersede this simply process have been tried and patented, but without success. The native way is still the best, and it produces a fine fiber of which thread is spun and cloth woven that excels the best Tussock silk.

The manufacture of sugar is not carried on in a large way, but on small plantations with antiquated machinery. There are a few factories, but they are isolated. Some years ago an enterprising Australian established a central sugar factory and laid down miles of pipes for the conveyance of the cane juice to the boilers, and generally went to vast expense. The factory was there and the engines, with the most recent improvements, vacuum pans, and what not. The only thing that was wanting was the plantations to supply the juice. And thus the money was lost, and the pipes that were to conduct the cane juice now convey limpid water to the inhabitants of Manila.

O. S. Williams, consul at Manila, reported February, 1898, as follows (Consular Reports, June, 1898, page 294):

During the quarter ended December 31, 1897, there were exported from these islands to the United States and Great Britain 216,898 bales of hemp (280 pounds per bale), of which 138,732 bales went to the United States and only 78,166 bales to Great Britain.

During the year 1897 there was an increase in the export of hemp from the Philippines to continental Europe of 19,741 bales; to Australia, 2,192 bales; to China, 28 bales; to Japan, 2,628 bales, and to the United States, 133,896 bales, a total increase of 158,485 bales, while to Great Britain there was a decrease of 22,348 bales. (This report is to appear in the forthcoming edition of Commercial Relations, 1896-97, but is printed now on account of the general demand for information.)

Thus, of increased shipments from the Philippines, those to the United States were 54 per cent greater than to all other countries combined.

Of the total exports of hemp from the Philippines for the ten years ended 1897, amounting to 6,528,935 bales (914,055 tons), 41 per cent went to the United States.

During the same years the Philippine Islands exported to the United States and to Europe 1,582,904 tons of sugar, of which 875,150 tons went to the United States, 666,391 tons to Great Britain, and 41,363 tons to continental Europe; showing that of the total exports more than 55 per cent went to the United States.

At the current values in New York of hemp (4 cents per pound) and of raw sugar (34 cents per pound) the exports of these two products alone from these islands to the United States during the ten years under review amounted to \$99,263,722.80, or an average of nearly \$8,926,372 per year.

Data as to cigars, tobacco, copra, woods, hides, shells, indigo, coffee, etc., are not now obtainable; but a conservative estimate would so raise the above figures as to show United States imports from these islands to average about \$1,000,000 per month. To-day I have authenticated invoices for export to United States amounting to \$138,066.12.

Later I will write of the Philippine tariff, import and export, being now engaged in translating it into English. The export duties and charges here on the hemp and sugar exported to the United States during the ten years ended with 1897 amounted to \$5,172,994.87.

It is, from the above, very apparent that the trend of trade is toward the United States, and my best endeavors will be exerted for its further extension.

There are here 22 consulates, representing the several countries, but the volume of the export trade coming under my official supervision equals that of my 21 colleagues combined.

OSCAR F. WILLIAMS, Consul.

MANILA, February 28, 1898.

According to the returns of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department, the annual imports into the United States from the Philippine Islands amounted to \$74,150,284 during the ten years ended June 30, 1897, or \$7,415,028 per year. For the seven years ended with 1894 the imports averaged \$8,564,611 per year, but for the last three years the imports fell off nearly one-half, amounting to only \$4,731,366, \$4,982,857, and \$4,383,740 in 1895, 1896, and 1897, respectively.

Isaac M. Elliott, consul at Manila, reported, September 20, 1894 (Consular Report, June, 1895, page 205):

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

There is considerable demand for butter in Manila, but outside of the city there is no market for dairy produce. The natives never eat butter or any other dairy produce, although cape buffaloes are very numerous, and give a fair supply of milk if taken proper care of. Still, the natives let the cattle go dry as soon as the calf is large enough to take care of itself, which is usually the same period as our cows require for the same purpose.

In and about Manila there are a few small herds of Australian cows, the milk from which is sold in the city. The quality is not nearly so good as that from cows in a colder climate, but we are glad to get it, and pay 40 cents (Mexican) per bottle, each bottle holding three-fourths of a quart, English measure; but as the cows soon deteriorate in so hot a climate, there is but small profit in the business, even at the high price of milk. For butter we pay 50 to 60 cents (Mexican) per tin can, holding somewhat less than a pound. But, as I said before, with the exception of Manila and a few towns, say Iloilo and Cebu, no butter is sold, and I fear that there will never be much of a market in this country for dairy produce.

As to apples and other fruits, I am quite sure that no trade could be built up, except in the preserved form, for the following reasons, viz: (1) The long voyage in a steamer's hold in the close, hot atmosphere prevailing nine months out of the year, and the transshipping at Hongkong to other steamers for the passage here, which usually takes five days via Amoy, would rot the fruit before arrival; (2) with the exception of a few Europeans, who might

be willing to pay a fair price, there would be no sale for them if brought in good condition, and I doubt very much if a trade could ever be built up for fruits such as the circular describes.

But I do think that, with proper energy, a large trade in canned fruits might be had here, as every person I have spoken to on the subject admits that our California fruits are the best in the world. Messrs. Warner Blodgett & Co., Manila, brought out quite a large consignment, but, not being in the retail trade, of course did not meet with much success. I have used some of the fruit, which was in store nearly two years, and it was still in good condition. Except a few cans that had rusted around the edges, all the cans were in good condition. I would suggest a covering of some material to be applied to the tin that would prevent the rapid destruction of the cans.

It is impossible to give figures of what portion of the whole imports of the articles mentioned is shared by the United States.

ISAAC M. ELLIOTT, Consul.

MANILA, September 20, 1894.

As to American flour, Mr. Cowan, consul at Manila, reported in February, 1894 (Consular Reports, June, 1894, pages 308, 309):

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

CEBU.

Standard of living.—The standard of living in the Cebu district is not high. The ordinary food of the bulk of the population consists of rice and maize, which are always procurable at moderate prices. These have always been the food of the people, and they do not show any desire to alter their mode of living.

Quality of flour used.—"Sperry's XXX" flour is practically the only kind sold here.

Imports of flour and wheat.—Flour is not imported directly into this district, the supply being drawn from Manila. It is estimated that 400 quarter sacks are consumed here monthly, principally in the form of bread, by the European community.

Wheat is not imported at all.

Exchange and shipping facilities.—The financial arrangements of the district are carried out in Manila by representative agencies here. As stated before, our supplies come through Manila.

Obstacles to trade.—The only obstacles to the extension of trade in American flour are the conservatism of the natives and their disinclination to work, which prevents their earning more than sufficient to purchase the cheapest form of food, which is probably maize. In my opinion, therefore, the demand for American flour is likely to be of slow growth.

G. E. A. CADELL, Consular Agent.

CEBU, March 8, 1894.

MANILA.

Standard of living.—The Caucasian element here live very much as they do at home, but the natives and Chinese, who form over 99 per cent of the population, are rice eaters. There is, however, a large consumption of flour by the European population. The troops and naval forces also use considerable quantities. The natives, especially those living near the large towns, eat bread made of wheat flour.

Imports of flour and wheat.—The imports of American flour, imported from China, amounted to 335,000 sacks (quarter barrels) and 329,000 sacks in 1891 and 1892, respectively. The statistics for 1893 are not yet available.

Practically all the flour imported is American flour. Occasionally a sailing vessel leaves San Francisco to load outward at a Philippine port, and it often finds it convenient to take flour in lieu of ballast.

Such imports would be credited to the United States, but almost every sack of flour that finds its way to these islands is transhipped at Hongkong into local steamers, and the customs statistics credit the import to China. Some small lots of Japanese and Australian flour also come via Hongkong, but these grades can not compare either in quality or price with California flour.

Wheat is not imported into these islands.

Duties.—The duty on quarter-barrel sacks of flour is 50 cents each, including duty on the sack, and on wheat, 60 cents per 100 kilograms. The duty is the same on flour from all countries, except that from Spain. Spanish flour pays but 20 cents per barrel, and Spanish wheat but 6 cents per 100 kilograms. It was expected that when these differential duties went into force (April 1, 1892) a large demand for Spanish flour would set in. This, however, has not proved to be the case.

Exchange and shipping facilities.—Flour business is only possible where a bank credit on London is opened by some bank here through some other bank in San Francisco. There is no direct shipping between these islands, except as before stated.

Trade outlook.—If flour were put on the free list here, a much larger consumption would doubtless ensue. At present a 50-pound sack sells at wholesale at \$2.25, local currency.

C. H. COWAN, Consul.

MANILA, February 7, 1894.

It has been demonstrated beyond any possibility of doubt that the Philippine Islands will become formidable competitors with the United States in the raising of cotton, and especially so as the Chinese labor in the Philippines can be secured for very much less than any labor can be made available in the United States. Realizing this, English capitalists are, according to the report of Consul Frankenthal, now completing a 6,000-spindle cotton mill, with \$200,000 capital, for the purpose of manufacturing the native cotton. (Consular Reports for November, 1898, page 446.)

The history of cotton raising in the Philippines up to 1889 is thus given by Consul Alexander R. Webb in his report of August 8, 1889:

Until a comparatively few years ago considerable bush cotton was raised in the Philippine Archipelago, and nearly all of it was made into coarse cloth for the natives by means of rude machinery; but it was found that the English and German cotton fabrics could be bought for very much less than the Philippine goods, and the industry was allowed to languish until it died out entirely. The rapid growth of the hemp and sugar trade here probably contributed largely to this result, for the natives, as well as Europeans, soon learned that there was much money to be made out of hemp and sugar, and very little, if any, out of cotton.

But within the past two years interest in the subject of cotton growing has been revived with the experiments made with American and Egyptian cotton seed by some Spaniards and Mestizos, who have conceived the idea that the Philippines can be made to yield to Spain a rich revenue if the plant is cultivated after modern methods. The climate and soil in some parts of the archipelago have been declared favorable to the rapid growth of cotton, and the experiments, which thus far have been conducted on a small scale, have supported this conclusion.

Last year a small quantity of excellent cotton was raised and sent to Barcelona, where it was manufactured into tablecloths and napkins and returned to Manila, where they were exhibited in the retail dry goods stores as evidences of the possibilities of the cotton culture here, and attracted a great deal of attention. This has encouraged those who have taken an active interest in the subject, and it is considered possible that within a few years cotton may have a place among the exports of the Philippines.

The following extracts are from the Bulletin de la Societe de Geographie Commerciale, Paris, Volume XIX, No. 4:

The land is wonderfully productive, but lacks intelligent cultivation. So wasteful have been the methods that, in spite of the wonderful fertility of the soil, the harvests have in some places diminished. This is true of maize in the island of Cebu and of sugar cane in the province of Pangasinan, where new plantations must now be made every year, while at Negros the land yields many times in succession. The rice production, formerly so large, has so fallen off that importations have been found necessary.

The production of cotton is also diminishing, for the same reasons that apply to rice. It grows in the provinces of North and South Ilocos, Union, Abra, and Pangasinan. The kinds cultivated are *Gossypium barbadense* and *Bombax pentandrum*. The ground is almost never prepared, and the cotton is silky in quality and would easily become a valuable product if attention were given to the cultivation. In the two provinces of Ilocos too great humidity is not to be feared for this plant, for the season of rain is well defined here from June until October, and the land is adapted to its cultivation. Nevertheless, the indolence of the Indians has caused cotton to take an inferior rank among the products of the colony.

According to the statement of Section of Foreign Markets, Department of Agriculture, in Bulletin No. 14 of the year 1898, the average importation of cotton manufactures into the Philippine Islands since 1886 has been a little less than \$6,000,000. With the introduction of the cotton mills now building and in project this importation will cease. The development of the cotton industries in the Philippines means a direct loss to the cotton men of the United States of \$6,000,000 a year.

In addition to the bush cotton in the Philippines there is also a tree cotton, of which Consul Webb says:

The tree cotton, which is very plentiful in nearly all the islands, has been experimented with to some extent, but, I am told, without satisfactory results, the fiber being too short for spinning. Again, it is asserted that if the proper machinery were used for cleaning it, it would be found that it could be spun and might take the place of bush cotton for many purposes.

Its production would cost nothing except the expense of gathering, as it needs no cultivation. Samples of it were sent to England a short time ago, where it was mistaken, it is said, for Tahitian sea-island cotton, the fiber being quite long enough for spinning if properly cleaned. Here it is used for stuffing pillows, cushions, mattresses, etc., but I believe that no attempt has ever been made here to spin it. It is thought, however, that if a proper machine for cleaning and preparing it for market could be had, it might be made a good, profit-yielding article of export.

What follows is a statement made by Mr. W. M. Mason:

No matter how well read a person may be, few in this country realize the great amount of sickness which has prevailed among the Americans who have attempted to settle in the Philippine Islands. It has been to the advantage of the Administration to keep all unfavorable reports regarding this matter in the background, in order that the ranks of the Philippine army may be well filled from those young men who are fascinated by the alluring prospects which a new, and in many ways unknown, country always holds out to youth.

Since the day when the American army landed at Manila up to the present time the many hospitals established by the military have been filled to overflowing with soldiers and civilians of the United States who were unable to stand the severe climatic conditions of the country. Hundreds have died in the prime of youth who, if they had remained in America, would have lived long and useful lives and would have been of much more service to their Government than unnecessarily giving up their lives to the ravages of the diseases of the Philippines.

In this report, which will soon be made to the Secretary of War, the Surgeon-General will say:

"After the occupation of Manila the sick lists of the regiments increased week by week, due chiefly to intestinal, malarial, and venereal diseases. This continued until the middle of December, when the heavy rains ceased."

Here I would invite attention to the following tabulation, showing annual rates per thousand of strength, deduced from the reported experience of four months in the Philippines, as compared with the average annual rates at military stations in the United States during the ten years 1886-1895, inclusive:

	Philippines.		Garrisons in United States.	
	Admission rate.	Death rate.	Admission rate.	Death rate.
Total diseases and injuries	3,016	9.26	1,254	7.12
Injuries	108	1.80	248	2.28
Typhoid fever	47	5.16	6	.64
Malarial fevers	370	-----	96	.14
Venereal diseases	82	.48	76	.02
Diarrheal diseases	445	.48	116	.13
Bronchitis and influenza	66	.36	101	.02

"From these figures it will be seen that the admission rate in Manila has been comparatively large, due mainly to malarial diseases, which are climatic, and to diarrheal diseases, which are no doubt in large part due to errors and irregularities of diet on the part of affected individuals. The malarial diseases exceed their prevalence in the United States in the proportion of 370 to 96, and the diarrheal diseases in the proportion of 445 to 116, or about 4 to 1 in both instances.

"Venereal diseases have been slightly in excess, being equal to an annual rate of 82 per 1,000 men, but there is reason to believe that this reported rate does not express the extent the prevalence of these diseases among the troops in Manila."

The great prevalence of venereal diseases in the Philippine Islands has been remarked upon by all of the Regular Army surgeons who have been stationed in those islands, and who have made reports to the Surgeon-General of the Army. At one time it was stated by an officer of the Medical Department that of the many hundreds of men who were in the hospitals over one-half were suffering from some venereal disease.

Syphilis is extremely common to the people of the Philippines and is of such form as to have greatly baffled the medical treatment of the surgeons who have been with the American Army. It is a common sight to see a native walking on the streets of Manila infected with this disease to such an extent that he presents an appearance of rotting away.

Many of the Americans who have gone to Manila, either to fight with the insurgents or to try and make a fortune, have died from smallpox. For some time after the forces of the United States occupied Manila little care was taken to prevent this disease from spreading among the troops. Very few of the natives are to be seen on the streets of Manila who do not show unmistakable signs of having had this terrible disease. It has been stated on good authority that smallpox is more prevalent in the Philippine Islands than any other place in the world.

The following are some extracts taken from the reports of Major Potter, one of the surgeons stationed in the Philippines:

OCTOBER 16, 1898.

First Colorado Infantry: There has been a steady increase of sickness in this regiment since the 1st instant, the percentage of sick to total strength having risen from 9 on October 1 to 15 on October 15. Intestinal and malarial cases form more than two-thirds of the total sick. The heaviest sick list occurs in companies recruited in large cities, and the smallest number in the companies from small towns and mining camps.

"First Nebraska Infantry.—This regiment has had a large sick report, which is now 17 per cent of the total strength."

"Tenth Pennsylvania Infantry.—Intestinal and malarial diseases constitute the bulk of the sickness. The percentage of sick to total present strength has been 12 to 13 during the last three weeks."

"Eighth United States Infantry.—The percentage of sick has varied from 7 to 9 since October 1, the cases being chiefly intestinal, malarial, and typhoid. Two cases of variola recently appeared in the command."

The reports of Major Potter, made after this time, show a steady increase in the percentage of sick. This was due largely to the rainy season, which is particularly trying to the Americans. At this time of the year there is a steady downpour, resulting in much sickness. The days are hot and damp, and the nights are cold and very uncomfortable.

Among civilians, who did not have the great care and supervision of the Regular Army surgeon, there was naturally much more sickness than that noticeable among the troops. In fact, the climate of the Philippines is by all odds the worst enemy which the Americans have been forced to meet since the occupation of the islands. Many of the young men who have gone to Manila in the hopes of making their fortune have returned to the United States, after having had some severe sickness from which they will never wholly recover, thoroughly disgusted with all pertaining to the Philippines and the people who inhabit them.

It has been found that the health conditions in the interior are not any better than those in the city of Manila. In speaking of the condition of the troops stationed at San Fernando, the Surgeon-General will say in his report:

"Besides, San Fernando had a local reputation as a healthful locality; in fact, it was regarded by the Filipinos as a kind of health resort. Yet the sick lists of the commands continued to increase and the sick failed to show any noteworthy sign of progress toward recovery of their strength. These regiments were shortly afterwards withdrawn from San Fernando to their barracks in Manila, where a change for the better was speedily manifested in the medical records."

In the report of Lieut. Col. Henry Lippincott, United States Army, chief surgeon, Department of the East Pacific and Eighth Army Corps, the following observation, much to the point, is made:

"Perhaps it may not be out of place here to express my professional opinion as to the length of military service in the Philippine Islands.

"From sufficient experience, I know that Americans are not, as a rule, able to endure this climate for a longer period than two years. Climatic diseases and the great enervation due to excessive heat combine to render a longer stay here dangerous to the service and to the individual."

The report of Colonel Lippincott continues in the same strain to show that it was necessary to take the greatest care to prevent diseases common to the islands from becoming prevalent among the American Army. This, however, is a self-evident fact from the various reports which have come from General Otis to the Adjutant-General relative to the sickness among the troops. It seems to be the opinion among Army officers who are stationed in the Philippines, and who saw service in Cuba, that the former place is much more unhealthy than the latter.

The above facts and conditions have been carefully selected from the best sources. They speak for themselves and demonstrate my contention that the Philippine Islands do not hold out any inducements to our farmers, laborers, and business men to leave this country in order to enter upon such a field of labor and enterprise. But to the imperialist, to those who delight in military glory, to those in whose bosoms burn the fire of conquest and the lust of acquisition, to those who love to exercise the power of the sword, the permanent retention of the Philippine Islands and their government as a colony present many and strong temptations.

To the sober-minded and industrious citizen such a prospect does not appeal. We can not forget that this same policy of imperialism and military glory dazzled the imagination and wrought the ruin of ancient Greece; it caused the downfall of the Roman Republic; it disintegrated the power built up with so much care by Charles V; it caused the overthrow of the great Napoleon. To-day England is shedding the blood of her most illustrious sons and spending millions of money to maintain her policy of colonization and imperialism. Having once started on her career of conquest and acquisition, she has never been able to stop, and her war drums have been beating for two centuries in every quarter of the globe.

Let us stay our footsteps on the threshold of imperialism. Let us meet the new century with our faces set against "criminal aggression." Let us bestow upon distant peoples the great boon of American freedom and American civilization. Above all, let us be true to the teachings of our fathers and to those eternal principles of liberty which alone can preserve to us the goodly heritage we possess. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE].

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 14, line 18, after the word "peace," insert the following: "Provided further, That enlisted men receiving or entitled to the 20 per cent increased pay herein authorized shall not be entitled to or receive any additional increased compensation for what is known as extra or special duty."

Mr. HULL. I think that amendment is perfectly proper and right.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HULL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment, in line 13, after the word "pay," to insert the word "proper," so that it will read "for the pay proper of all officers."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 13, page 14, after the word "pay," insert the word "proper."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HULL. In line 18 I offer a similar amendment, after the word "pay" to insert the word "proper."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 18, page 14, after the word "pay," insert the word "proper."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I understand the section is now perfected, and I wish to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] if it is intended as a permanent policy that the officers and soldiers serving in these possessions shall receive this extra pay whether there is peace or war?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. That is to be a permanent policy?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. And I suppose the committee have considered that thoroughly?

Mr. HULL. Yes; they are agreed upon it.

Mr. RIDGELY. Mr. Chairman, at the time the point of order was withdrawn by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE], I rose to renew the point of order myself. I would ask, however—

Mr. HULL. It is certainly too late to raise the point of order after the section has been repeatedly amended, perfected, and adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not made a point of order. The gentleman is making a statement.

Mr. RIDGELY. I would ask unanimous consent that the balance of this matter, down to the bottom of this page, go over with the other that was reserved until to-morrow.

Mr. HULL. Oh, well, I object to that. It has no connection with the other matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For additional pay for increased rank when in command by competent authority, \$50,000.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, by instruction of the committee, I offer the following amendment to come in after the word "dollars," in line 20, page 14.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, after the word "dollars," in line 20, page 14, the following:

"Provided, That no part of this sum shall be used for pay of officers assigned to a higher command than their rank in the Army, unless such assignment is to fill a vacancy existing in the grade to which such officer shall be assigned."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

All the money hereinbefore appropriated shall be disbursed and accounted for by the Pay Department as pay of the Army, Regular and Volunteer, and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, after the word "appropriated," in line 21, page 14, the following: "except the appropriation for mileage to officers when authorized by law."

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. My amendment is to insert, after the word "appropriated," the words "except the appropria-

tion for mileage to officers when authorized by law." That has been the form of the appropriation heretofore.

Mr. HULL. I think that amendment is all right. It is simply an inadvertence that it is omitted, and there is no objection to it whatever.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Subsistence of the masters, officers, crews, and employees of the vessels of the Army transport service, \$219,492.75.

Mr. McRAE. For the purpose of getting some information, I make a point of order against this paragraph. I should like to have the gentleman explain what it means.

Mr. HULL. Masters of vessels and others are paid in the appropriation for this fiscal year, and the only object of putting in this language is to give more particular information as to what we are appropriating for. If you strike it out here and increase the amount in the other part of the bill for the Subsistence Department, they would be paid just the same as they have been during this fiscal year.

Mr. McRAE. This is not an increase in officers, then?

Mr. HULL. No, it is only for more particular information.

Mr. McRAE. And it is not new legislation?

Mr. HULL. It is not new legislation, unless you say that by going into more detail than heretofore it is new legislation.

Mr. McRAE. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Difference between the cost of the ration at 25 cents and the cost of rations differing in whole or in part from the ordinary ration, to be issued to enlisted men in camp during periods of recovery from low conditions of health consequent upon service in unhealthy regions or in debilitating climates, to be expended only under special authority of the Secretary of War, \$180,000.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the committee have left out of the bill the following, which has been in heretofore, and I now offer it as an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 9, on page 17, insert the following:

"Total for Subsistence Department, \$10,556,492.75, to be disbursed and accounted for as subsistence of the Army, and for that purpose shall constitute one fund."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT.

Regular supplies: Regular supplies of the Quartermaster's Department, including their care and protection.

Mr. HULL. I suggest to the gentleman from New York that he allow the paragraph to be read.

Mr. DRIGGS. I am perfectly willing to wait until we reach page 21, as I suggested to the gentleman a while ago.

Mr. HULL. I only wish to have the paragraph read. I think the gentleman will agree with me that it is not in order to offer even a pro forma amendment to a paragraph until the Clerk finishes the reading.

Mr. DRIGGS. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph will be read, and the Chair will then recognize the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT.

Regular supplies: Regular supplies of Quartermaster's Department, including their care and protection, consisting of stoves and heating apparatus required for heating offices, hospitals, barracks, and quarters, and recruiting stations, also ranges and stoves, and appliances for cooking and serving food, and repair and maintenance of such heating and cooking appliances; of fuel and lights for enlisted men, including recruits, guards, hospitals, storehouses, and offices, and for sale to officers; and including also fuel and engine supplies required in the operation of modern batteries at established posts; for post bakeries: for the necessary furniture, text-books, paper, and equipment for the post schools and libraries; for the tableware and mess furniture for kitchens and mess halls, each and all for the enlisted men, including recruits; of forage in kind for the horses, mules, and oxen of the Quartermaster's Department at the several posts and stations and with the armies in the field, and for the horses of the several regiments of cavalry, the batteries of artillery, and such companies of infantry and scouts as may be mounted, and for the authorized number of officers' horses, including bedding for the animals; of straw for soldiers' bedding, and of stationery, including blank books for the Quartermaster's Department, certificates for discharged soldiers, blank forms for the Pay and Quartermaster's Departments, and for printing department orders and reports, \$8,264,000.

Mr. DRIGGS. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to preface my remarks on the subject which I desire to speak upon by reading a newspaper article that, while it is somewhat long, is of such great moment and importance to every member of this House irrespective of politics and to every citizen and person in this country that I desire to read it in full, as it pertains absolutely and directly to a certain portion of this bill—the transport service. I will say, however, before reading this article, that it is taken from the Brooklyn Daily Eagle.

The Eagle is in no sense of the word what is commonly known in the parlance of the day as a "yellow journal." It is a most conservative and independent paper. To show how absolutely independent the paper is in politics it will in one campaign support Republican candidates, and if not satisfied will turn around in the next campaign and support the candidates of the Democratic party. I make this statement so that it may be known that the paper is perfectly fair, and I have never known an article to appear in it that its management have not been able to substantiate when it appears in their columns. I will ask the Clerk to read the article.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Brooklyn Daily Eagle, March 27, 1900.]

A PALACE OF THE SEAS IS THIS ARMY TRANSPORT—WHERE AND HOW THE GOVERNMENT LAVISHED \$500,000 ON THE SUMNER—SOLID MAHOGANY FURNITURE—HER OFFICERS' QUARTERS WOULD PUT TO BLUSH THE STATE-ROOMS OF MANY OCEAN LINERS.

Those people who think that the Army transport service of the United States is a pretty expensive institution would receive a rather startling confirmation of their views if they paid a visit to the *Sumner*, which is now lying at the foot of Pacific street in Brooklyn. Once upon a time the *Sumner* was a collier. That was during the war with Spain, when she sailed under the name of *Cassius*. Since that time she has been converted into a floating palace at an expense of over \$750,000. Her staterooms and interior fittings are finer in many respects than those of many of the ocean liners. Apparently there has been no limit to the expenditure of money upon this ship, which is intended to carry troops from here to Manila.

Attention has been directed to late to the *Sumner* because of the fact that she was sent to a private yard to have damages to her bottom plates repaired. It was then announced that this work would cost \$2,500. Now it appears that the bill will amount to about \$8,000.

Word also comes from Washington to-day that a body of high Government officials will inspect the *Sumner* to-morrow to see that she is in perfect condition for her voyage. They can scarcely be disappointed with her interior furnishings, to say the least, if they make as careful an investigation as did an Eagle reporter who made a tour of the ship yesterday.

The *Sumner*, when she sails from this port on Thursday afternoon, will carry over 1,300 persons. In outside appearance she is not unlike the other Army transports, although she is considerably larger than some of those which have been coming to this port. It requires an inspection of her interior to reveal the extravagant manner in which she has been fitted up.

After the Spanish-American war, during which she was used as a collier by the Navy Department, she was transferred to the Quartermaster's Department of the Army and converted into a transport, the Navy Department having no further use for her. The *Sumner* was taken to the Norfolk Navy-Yard, where she was remodeled and refitted, leaving that yard and coming direct to Brooklyn. She arrived here about a week ago.

It was while coming out of the channel from the Norfolk Yard that she collided with a railroad barge and was slightly damaged. This damage to her bow plates was repaired at the Erie Basin, instead of at the Brooklyn Navy-Yard, where naval officials contend it should have been done. It is now said a bill for about \$8,000 will be presented to the Secretary of War for these repairs, which naval officials of the local navy-yard say were very slight. At the Brooklyn Navy-Yard it costs about \$500 or \$600 to dock a warship, and the damage to the *Sumner* having been slight naval officials do not hesitate to say that a bill for even \$2,000 would be unusual.

It is also contended that the largest dry dock at the navy-yard having been empty when the *Sumner* arrived here, and work in the navy-yard having been slack at that time, the vessel should have been repaired at the navy-yard instead of by private contractors. Navy officials say just as good work could have been done by them in the same time and at a great saving of money to the Government.

The visitor to the *Sumner* is dazzled by the magnificence which confronts him on every side. The very best of everything that money can buy has been provided. The quarters of the officers of the ship and the commissioned men, who will be carried as passengers, are finer than those on some of the first-class trans-Atlantic steamers.

There are 29 staterooms, each accommodating two persons, and 3 double staterooms. These staterooms are larger than those on the average first-class ocean liners. The berths and dressers are made of solid mahogany, while the knobs and decorations are of the most expensive brass work. Each stateroom is provided with the finest quality of chinaware, suspended on nickel-plated supports. All trays and, in fact, every metal fixture in these rooms are of the finest quality of brass, heavily nickel-plated.

An immense French plate mirror in a solid brass frame, nickel-plated, adorns each room, while two cut-glass tumblers, costing at wholesale price 75 cents each, and two cut-glass water bottles, which cost \$2.75 each, are among the other furnishings provided for the officers occupying staterooms. Each stateroom is provided with an electric fan. The berths are furnished with the finest quality of linen. Elaborately designed velvet carpets and rugs cover the stateroom floors, while engraved frosted glass covers the front door of each of these apartments.

There is an immense refrigerator with a capacity of making 75 tons, while the bakeries have ovens sufficient to furnish 2,000 loaves of bread daily. A butcher shop, ice house, laundry, kitchen, electric-light plant, and similar necessary adjuncts are located in rooms handsomely finished, the floors of which are covered with tiling or a corrugated artificial stone.

The main saloon is the most elaborate as well as the most expensive feature on the ship. The tables, chairs, closets, umbrella and cane stands, as well as all other woodwork in this room, are of solid mahogany.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DRIGGS. I ask that my time may be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

There are 2 long and 4 square tables, each of which is said to have cost \$300, while the 60 chairs, also of heavy mahogany and upholstered in buff leather, cost about \$15 each. A solid mahogany sideboard at one end of the dining saloon, about 10 feet long and 3 feet wide and extending to the ceiling, with great beveled-edge French plate mirrors, cost \$1,500.

The sideboard contains \$8,000 worth of silverware for use of the commissioned officers and officials of the transport. The silverware consists of knives, forks, spoons, dozens of nut picks, nut crackers, 125 napkin rings, 7 dozen fruit knives, coffee spoons, several coffee and tea sets, several candlesticks; in all, numbering over 600 pieces.

A solid mahogany bookcase with beveled plate glass doors occupies a place opposite the beautiful sideboard.

There is a gorgeously decorated smoking room on the upper deck, also fitted with solid mahogany furniture. The twelve bathrooms are wonderful creations of the plumber's art and fit for the use of a king, each being fitted with a solid porcelain bath tub, which cost over \$300.

Mr. STEELE. I would like to ask the gentleman, before we proceed further in this reading—

Mr. DRIGGS. I do not agree to yield. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. STEELE. I make the point of order that this is not admissible under the rules to be read unless the gentleman intends to stand by it himself.

Mr. DRIGGS. I propose to stand by it.

Mr. STEELE. It is not germane to the amendment, and unless the gentleman desires—

Mr. DRIGGS. I insist on my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asked unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes, to which there was no objection, and it is being read in the time of the gentleman.

Mr. STEELE. I object, unless he knows it is true and proposes to stand by it. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield further, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A solid porcelain washstand, fit for the mansion of a millionaire, occupies a corner in each room. They are said to have cost about \$50. The floors of these rooms are laid with small tiling, while all the metal work is brass, heavily nickel-plated. Dozens of washrooms, with three different kinds of shower baths, are scattered over the ship. The plumbing work of the ship is all open, the pipes being nickeled wherever exposed.

Accommodations for 908 soldiers have been provided. Each man will be given a berth or sleeping place arranged on galvanized frames. These quarters are in tiers of three and comfortable as compared with the hammocks which the man-of-war's men occupy on the warships owned by Uncle Sam. The floor of these apartments is covered with tiling. The lavatories provided for the soldiers are better than those usually supplied first-class passengers. There are four sections of the *Sumner* set apart for the soldiers. The lavatories and washrooms for the soldiers adjoin their quarters and contain 24 solid porcelain washstands, supplied with hot and cold water.

An operating room in the after part of the *Sumner* is equal to any, it is said, in Greater New York. Several doctors who examined this room pronounce it the best they have ever seen, in point of convenience as well as elegance of finish. The diet kitchen also dazzles the visitor, everything being of elaborate finish. It is located next to the operating room.

The kitchen adjoining the dining saloon is a model in every respect and would reflect credit on the finest ocean steamship or hotel. It is provided with everything that money can buy, all the utensils and other apparatus being of copper and nickel. An automatic egg boiler, costing \$75—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DRIGGS. I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended five minutes more.

Mr. STEELE. I will have to object to that. The gentleman would not allow me to ask him a question.

Mr. DRIGGS. I wanted the sentence to be completed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee where the bills for this extravagant supply to this ship or transport are audited. There are \$200, I understand, for bath tub, and \$750,000 for furnishing this transport. I want to ask where these bills are audited?

Mr. HULL. I will say they are audited by the War Department. We make the appropriation. This is in your time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am asking the gentleman the question in my five minutes, and I want an answer.

Mr. HULL. I was going to take a little of my own time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I only wanted to ask a question of you.

Mr. HULL. This is paid for transportation under the head of the Quartermaster-General's Department, and so far as the bills are concerned, we are informed that they would be audited by the War Department.

Mr. DRIGGS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Certainly.

Mr. DRIGGS. The question I desire to propound to the gentleman from Tennessee will in extent by the time the sentence is completed be found rather long. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee to the fact that he does not understand as I do and realize the enormity of the extravagance of this transport *Sumner*. Did he know that the transport *Sumner* contains in her a machine among her cooking utensils, a \$75 machine, and for what purpose—just for boiling eggs [laughter], that is worked by ordinary clockwork? And does the gentleman from Tennessee realize that from the reading of this newspaper article; and, in addition to that, did he realize that they had cut-glass tumblers at 75 cents apiece wholesale? And did he realize, in addition to that, that they had cut-glass water bottles that cost \$2.75 apiece?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I had no idea of that. [Great laughter.]

Mr. DRIGGS. And in addition to that, I would say to the gentleman from Tennessee, did he realize that in the morning these officers and men, after attiring themselves, and on their way down to the saloon to eat their breakfast, can admire their faultless uniforms in a \$1,500 plate-glass mirror?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I never dreamed of it. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. DRIGGS. And so, Mr. Chairman, I would say in addition—

Mr. STEELE. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. DRIGGS. I am asking the gentleman from Tennessee a question. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. As soon as I get through answering the gentleman from New York I will yield to the gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. DRIGGS. And in addition to that we are told that on this ship that is so magnificently fitted up that it is far more beautiful than private yachts of millionaires, on the tables where they eat breakfast there was \$8,000 worth of silverware; and if perchance it happened to be a dinner instead of a breakfast that they were eating, at the conclusion of the meal the nut picks and fruit knives they would then use were of solid silver. Did the gentleman realize that?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Never. [Laughter.]

Mr. DRIGGS. Did he realize that when we had here in the last Congress the war-revenue measure under consideration, the title of which bill was, "An act providing ways and means to meet the war expenses, and for other purposes," that the "other purposes" of that war measure was to fit any such thing as this transport *Sumner*, while the taxpayers of the United States were ground out of taxes now laid and that had been realized upon by the Administration?

Mr. McRAE. And they had to issue bonds.

Mr. DRIGGS (continuing). And did he realize that I, as one of the Democratic members of this House who voted in favor of this measure, knew of no such use that the money of the people of this country was to be put to under that bill; and if he had realized that he would have known that I would not have voted for such a measure for such purposes as that, because he knew and I knew we have no right to take the people's money and put it to any such use?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DRIGGS. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Tennessee may be extended five minutes.

Mr. HULL. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes to talk, but not for the reading of articles.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DRIGGS. But, Mr. Chairman, now that I have the time in my own right—

Mr. RICHARDSON. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. DRIGGS. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Do I understand that the answer to all the questions the gentleman propounded to me are found in the article that has just been read?

Mr. DRIGGS. Yes. Now, that I have the right to address the House in my own right, without any subterfuge—

Mr. STEELE. The other was no subterfuge. [Laughter.]

Mr. DRIGGS (continuing). I am willing to concede that when the only way I can, under the rule, get the right to talk in that way I am going to do it when such important questions are being considered here. I will say that during the war with Spain there was not a man, woman, or child in this country but realized the atrocious condition of affairs on the Army transports. We are told that the transports had men huddled in them in a manner and condition worse than any pigs in a western piggery.

Mr. Chairman, when I consider that when these young men were going out to fight for the honor of their country they were huddled together and treated in that shameful manner, and when brought back from Cuba each one declaiming against the transports, and I now consider that the war is practically over, conceded, at least, to be over by the Republican Administration and by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, I wonder why they—the Administration—had the assurance to allow the War Department or the Department of the Quartermaster-General to equip a ship like this in this palatial manner, when the men were treated on the other transports like pigs. I endeavored the other day to obtain from the chairman of the committee—

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Before the gentleman leaves that point, I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not it is his purpose to pursue this matter further by offering a proper resolution so that the House may make an investigation and ascertain the truth or falsity of the charges in the article.

Mr. DRIGGS. I do. I propose to insert the newspaper article as the "whereas."

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. Does the gentleman know that while this work was being done in the private ship yards of the country the Government yards were compelled to run under reduced time because of lack of appropriations?

Mr. DRIGGS. I have heard that stated, but I do not know

whether it is so. Now, when I asked the chairman of the Military Committee for the information as to decrease of Army appropriation and he told me it was only \$16,000,000 difference, as I recall it, I marveled at the small decrease—and if I quote him incorrectly I apologize for it—but as I recollect, he told me that the appropriations called for in this bill were absolutely essential to carry on the war in the Philippines, or for the maintenance of the army in the Philippines; I do not think he said "necessary for the war in the Philippines," but for the maintenance of the Army. Now, I can see where \$750,000 of this money has gone to, and I know not how much more of this money has gone in that same way.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. DRIGGS. Yes; for one question.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. For two questions?

Mr. DRIGGS. All right.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. What was the total cost of the vessel the gentleman complains of?

Mr. DRIGGS. I do not know.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Over a million dollars?

Mr. DRIGGS. I do not know; she is a beautiful ship; I have seen her.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. How much have the things cost extra that the gentleman thinks ought not to have gone into her?

Mr. DRIGGS. Seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars?

Mr. DRIGGS. Well, not altogether; of course I am simply stating it in bulk. I do not understand everything about this. I am not a jack-at-all-trades, and I can not tell you what the cost of the different things should be.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Of course the extra cost of fitting up the cabin in fine style is a mere trifle compared with the cost of a first-class vessel.

Mr. DRIGGS. Certainly it is infinitely more, as we are told by this article. Mr. Chairman, when we realize how the boys in blue in Cuba fought and suffered the torments of the damned from the infamous food that was dealt out to them, we can not but wonder why that was not the time to guard and take the best of care of them, and not now when the war is practically over. At all times we should take the best of care of every man willing to fight for his country, but at no one time shower thorns and another time shower roses.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, this is the first information I have had in regard to the newspaper article which has just been read, and the gentleman's speech as a supplement to the article seems to charge that we are now treating the soldiers too well.

Mr. DRIGGS. I never charged that.

Mr. HULL. The criticism by the Democratic party commenced on the Government when the war broke out. We had no transports and the Army had to go to Santiago, and a fleet was improvised. It was not what we wanted. It was the best we could do. The Democratic party raised a cry all over the country that our soldiers were put in transports and huddled together like pigs. Regiments begged for the privilege of going on these poorly appointed ships. The soldiers never complained.

It was reserved for the gentlemen who did not go into the service to raise this cry. [Applause on the Republican side.] Since then we have organized our transport service, and now they come up and say that we are treating the soldiers too well and spending too much money on the transports for men who travel between this country and our island possessions. I do not believe that that article is true in its details. I do believe that we have organized the best transport service that any government ever had in any age of the world. Neither England, Germany, nor France can compare with us in the splendor, if you want to call it so, of the transports we are now sending out to carry our troops back and forth.

Berths for men cool and well ventilated; hospital accommodations for the sick; an ice plant to provide an abundance of ice for all on board during the voyage through the Tropics; cold storage for an abundant supply of fresh meat, vegetables, and fruit, and all other appliances for the comfort and welfare of the men. Not huddled together like pigs now. Oh, no! But too extravagant, cry our Democratic friends.

The gentleman says, "Think of it, think of it, \$75 for a vessel to boil eggs in!" Well, think of a ship carrying 2,000 men. And if it requires twice that amount, or \$150, to buy a vessel to boil eggs in for those men, I say God bless the officer who will provide for them and give them the eggs. [Applause.] The gentleman says, "Think of it, think of it, we have got to provide porcelain-lined urinals for the men."

Mr. DRIGGS. I did not say that.

Mr. HULL. Yes, you did, substantially. Does the gentleman want to go back to the old tin institution? [Laughter.] We can

not suit him or his party. If in the stress of war we are obliged to utilize what we can hurriedly get together on short notice to achieve a victory, we meet the criticism of gentlemen on the other side for not doing better. In a time of peace, after the Government can provide and does provide the proper facilities for taking care of our troops, you come in here with a highly colored, sensational newspaper article which charges us with treating the soldiers too well.

Mr. DRIGGS. I did not do that.

Mr. HULL. By having read such an article you make the charge. I am proud of my friend from New York!

Mr. DRIGGS. Thank you.

Mr. HULL. But, thank God, this Government does not have to legislate to suit the gentleman from New York. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I have visited, in common with some other gentlemen of Congress, one or two of these transports. In San Francisco, just before the *Sheridan* sailed in June last for Manila, with 2,200 or 2,300 men aboard, we went on board the ship. It was scrupulously clean; it was splendidly appointed in all its parts. The storage room was inspected, the quarters for the men were inspected, the apartments for the officers were inspected by these members of Congress, and no ground for criticism was found. It was not extravagantly fitted up. It was a perfectly appointed troopship. The men all said that they were splendidly taken care of and that they looked forward with pleasure to their trip.

But while everything was in this perfect condition there was no such extravagance as would justify one word of criticism either from the gentleman from New York or any other Democrat in America. [Applause on the Republican side.] I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to this House that if there has been reckless extravagance in the fitting up of the two ships referred to by the gentleman from New York, the proper place for the gentleman to get full information is at the War Department.

Gentlemen can get there all the information they may want as to the detailed cost of every one of these vessels. There is no secret about it, and no desire to hide anything, and when gentlemen obtain such information they will find that these ships are fitted out perfectly, but not extravagantly. They will find that our Government to-day has organized a transport service better in all its parts for the care of officers and men and for the speedy performance of the duty for which this service is organized than the corresponding service of any other nation on earth. At first, in making our arrangements in connection with our transport service for the war, we met some criticism, and we acknowledged the correctness of it. The criticism was not just under the circumstances, but the service was poor.

Mr. STEELE. Other nations are now copying our ships.

Mr. HULL. As everyone knows, in the beginning, in order to accomplish results, we could not wait to build ships or fit up properly those we chartered or bought. But now that we have had time we have set the pace for the rest of the world. England and Germany—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HULL. I would like a little more time, so that I may at least conclude my sentence.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman may proceed five minutes longer.

Mr. HULL. I do not want that much time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. HULL. To-day these foreign nations have inspected our service; they have sent their experts here to examine our ships; and in place of our copying theirs, they are now copying ours. [Applause.] They bear generous testimony to our great results.

The United States of America, after thirty-five years of peace and without experience in the organization of a transport service, have within the last two years made such improvement in this line of service that the nations of the Old World, who have for years been engaged in this kind of business, have come to us and adopted our ideas, acknowledging them to be better than their own.

For one, as an American citizen, I am proud of the fact that this Government will spend whatever is necessary and proper to care for her soldiers on land or sea, and I am proud of the fact that we had men in authority during the last two years of our country's history able and willing to make such improvements that the whole civilized world acknowledges to-day the supremacy of the United States of America. [Applause.]

Mr. DRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have had no intention whatever to criticize anything but the extravagant equipment features of the transport service of the United States, and the gentleman from Iowa knows full well that the various items of extravagance which have been recited in the article read are true. I believe it to be true that in the construction and management of those ships there has been extravagance. And now I desire to go back and allude to something else.

I desire to say that I believe in allowing the dead past to bury its dead, and I sat here all through the last session of Congress and never once opened my mouth on the subject of what I witnessed

down at Camp Wikoff on Montauk Point, because I believed that was a page in the history of our country that should be closed.

At the outbreak of that war we had no preparation, and I believe, and I say it now, that many of the errors and mistakes of the War Department were made through lack of preparation; but that does not get away from the fact that the day I visited Montauk Point, at Camp Wikoff, I saw one of the Illinois troops come from one of those transports that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] has just told us about, and I tell you now that that ship, from deck to keel, was in as bad condition as were the prison ships in Wallabout Bay, and they were notorious for their filth and dirt.

I went all around through that camp, by a special permit from our then colleague, General Wheeler of Alabama. I went among the regulars, I went among the volunteers, I inquired from the officers and men as to the condition of these transports, and to a man they told me, and I have it in my diary at home, that the condition of those transports was simply damnable.

Now, how does that compare with the statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL]? I want to see our American troops, when they are transported from here to the Philippines or Hawaii or Puerto Rico, carried in the very best ships that money can buy and in the very soundest ships that money can buy, and I will vote for that kind of a proposition every time. [Applause.] But the moment the word "extravagance" comes in, there, I say, let us stop, and do not let us have any extravagance at all.

We know how much is necessary for the conduct of this war and for the Army. Mr. Chairman, we know full well what great industries in this country are demanding a reduction of the war-revenue tax; but just so long as the President of the United States tells me that there is war in the Philippines, or in any other place in this country, I propose to stand here and vote for every dollar that is necessary for the suppression of that war, and to vote for every man demanded by the President of the United States.

But the very moment the necessity for these appropriations stop, and the very moment that there are to be no more men required, then I would be recreant to the trust reposed in me by the people of my district were I not to rise here and declaim against woeful, wasteful extravagance.

Oh, ye shades of the immortal Holman, and other more modern watchdogs of the Treasury, what has become of your occupation, when you will allow such items as the equipment of the transport *Sumner* to go through an appropriation bill without an investigation?

I have no desire to emulate the footsteps of any of my distinguished predecessors as watchdogs of the Treasury. I believe in the most liberal appropriations necessary for the proper maintenance of the Government; but I do not believe in extravagance when the people are demanding economy. I do not believe in extravagance when taxation should be reduced, and I do not believe in extravagance when other necessary measures should be enacted and other necessary purposes should be followed out with the money that is wastefully, woefully, needlessly thrown away.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I only want to say a word. I have an acquaintance with the Quartermaster-General, who is the same one we have had since the breaking out of the Spanish war, a most worthy and, in my opinion, a most painstaking officer.

I do not believe that there has been undue expense upon this or any other transport. It does seem to me, I say to the gentleman from New York, if I had wanted to perpetrate a sensation upon the House I would have journeyed down to the Auditor's Office for the War Department, and to the War Department proper, and found out whether this highly colored article was inspired by somebody who was not pleased because the ship was not repaired at the navy-yard rather than at a private yard, or possibly by some private yard that wanted the job as against the one that did get it, or whether there was somebody wandering around who wanted the transport service put under the Navy, who inspired the article.

I would have found out something about it before I perpetrated the sensation, I think. Possibly, when my friend had found out about it, it would not have served his purpose in perpetrating a sensation. [Laughter.] I do not know whether that is so or not.

Mr. DRIGGS. Will the gentleman allow me there?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. DRIGGS. I have no desire to create a sensation whatever. It is against my nature and against my actions in this House. I simply desired to find out if this is the truth.

Mr. CANNON. Well, it is just about a mile to the two proper officers who could have told all about it, and where everything could have been found out. I have no knowledge about it, but my belief is that the *Sumner* is a splendid transport, as it ought to be, and so all our transports ought to be. Now, I will acknowledge, when you talk about a china service for the table, that probably they had better fitted it up with pewter plates. I do not know.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman will concede that \$200 for a bath tub is rather heavy.

Mr. CANNON. I do not know as to the cost of bath tubs. It is easy to say, "Is not that heavy?" I suppose some kind of a bath tub can be bought for twenty or twenty-five dollars. But my understanding is that the bath tubs which are now used by people who build even modest houses in this country—bath tubs of porcelain—cost from \$100 to \$150. I am told some of them cost thousands of dollars—three or four or five thousand dollars—for bathrooms and furnishings amongst the average constituency of my genial friend from New York [Mr. DRIGGS]. [Laughter.] I do not know about that.

Mr. DRIGGS. I only wish they had that money up there.

Mr. CANNON. It is easy to talk about a goblet costing 75 cents. It is easy to talk about mahogany furniture; and yet everybody knows that it is cheaper than walnut.

I do not know the necessity for this furnishing. I do know that there are 65,000 of our boys in the Philippines, 12,000 miles from home. I know that they had to be taken there, and that they have to be brought home, and perhaps others have got to go and come.

They can not jump there; they can not go there in a canoe or skiff; they can not sail there in a schooner. It is the duty of the Government to take them, and the Government, in the performance of this duty, has fitted up these transports. I apprehend when the fact is arrived at that it will be found they are well fitted up, so that you and I would not be ashamed of them—fitted up for the comfort and good reputation and well-being of the people who go upon them.

Now, I never went aboard a man-of-war or a cruiser but what I found better furniture, better knives and forks, better crockery, more highly polished furniture than there are in my house or in any house I suppose that I could get an invitation to go to. [Laughter.] But I was always glad of it. A service that goes about the world, carrying our boys and carrying our Navy, ought to be the best service for the comfort of the men that it is practicable to get, everything for efficiency without extravagance, and besides that it ought to be such, as it steams about the world, that when an American citizen goes aboard an American ship he will not be ashamed of his country. [Applause.]

Now, that is about all I want to say. I would not have said a thing, except that I happened to be acquainted with the Quartermaster-General. In my judgment there is not a more painstaking, industrious, worthy officer in the service of the Government, a man of good ability, and I felt right here, at the inception of this matter, that I ought to say that, and I have said it; and I am glad that in the future, now that we have had time to prepare these transports, our people will be able to travel without contracting disease from neglect or insufficient accommodation.

If that was not so, the Government would be subject now to just criticisms, whereas in its stress, when the Spanish war broke out, it was subjected to unjust criticism for insufficient transport service, which my friend even echoes, and which his party friends over there charged against the Government when it could not do any better. Now, much can be said about a glass goblet costing 75 cents. I have been in this House a quarter of a century, and I recollect that one Democratic statesman, chairman of the Committee on Accounts in the House, rose in his place upon that side, in a blue jeans suit, and, waving a little fan that cost a cent, and paid for from the contingent fund in the hot weather, for the use of members, said, "Mr. Speaker, look at the expense!"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Well, I did not think my five minutes was up. I want to have time to finish this incident, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask that the gentleman have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. Waving his little fan, a cent fan, he said, "Mr. Speaker, look at it—a fan bought from the contingent fund;" and he waved it back and forth off his face. Well, that nominated him as a candidate for governor of Indiana on the Democratic ticket. [Laughter.] I am glad we have progressed from those times. Those times were hard times.

Mr. FLETCHER. Democratic times.

Mr. CANNON. We have had harder times since that time. I am thankful to-day, with all our people fully employed at remunerative wages, that nowhere from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, from New York to the Golden Gate, can there be found one carping critic that will make a foolish criticism when we care properly for the boys that wear the blue as we transport them a great distance to their post of duty. [Loud applause.]

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of line 12, page 18, the following:

"Provided, That no part of the money appropriated hereinbefore or hereinafter shall be paid to the son of any member of Congress, provided such son secured his appointment to a place in the Army since the destruction of the battle ship *Maine* in Habana Harbor on or about the 15th of February, 1898."

Mr. HULL. I raise the point of order against that amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa raises the point of order against the amendment. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. STEELE. Let the gentleman be heard on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman did not ask to be heard.

Mr. LENTZ. I shall present later in the debate on this bill a discussion of that question by a gentleman who has been well known in history as Thomas Jefferson. I do not think it is out of order to limit an appropriation.

Mr. STEELE. I want to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order has been sustained to the provision, and the gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I move to strike out the last word. I desire to reply to the very pertinent inquiry made by the gentleman from Iowa, but before I do that I desire to direct attention to the manifest unfairness of the gentleman from Illinois as to the complaint raised by the gentleman from New York about the fitting out of this transport. These fine Smyrna rugs, \$1,500 looking-glass, solid mahogany tables costing \$300 apiece, this \$8,000 of solid silver, is not for the benefit of the boys in blue that seem to be so close to some of us here.

What better right have you on your side of the Chamber to speak for the boys in blue than gentlemen on this side? All patriotism is not over there. We are just as anxious to care for the boys in blue as you can be, but for one, speaking for myself alone, I am unwilling, Mr. Speaker, to drag in namby-pamby sentiment in order to catch a few votes, to vote money for extravagant living of officers on our ships.

Now to the pertinent inquiry of the chairman of this committee, "Can we treat our soldiers too well?" I desire to say, "Yes; we can treat them too well." It is dangerous to treat our soldiers too well; it fosters the military spirit. Ours is a nation of peace, and we do not desire to make war unless there be a stern necessity for it. We resort to it only to protect ourselves from invasion or to maintain our liberties; and if we propose to make war so alluring it will entice our boys from the farms and the workshops we will create the very sentiment in this country that we on this side are from time to time charging against the Republican party as dangerous.

We do not desire to foster the spirit of militarism, but, on the contrary, it has been the practice, it has been the belief of every citizen of the Republic, that war was to be resorted to only as a dire necessity, and it remains for one modern exponent of Christianity to make a bloody and relentless war, and without the sanction of the only constitutional body our Government authorizes to proclaim war. And, differing from my colleague, the gentleman from New York, I desire to say that I am unwilling to vote one centime of money to carry on a war which I believe has no right to exist under our Constitution, and which exists in violation of the law of the land. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am willing to take the responsibility. I have no complaint to make of our soldiers who do their duty, but I believe the man who is carrying on this war without sanction of Congress ought to be impeached in his place for doing so without a shred of law at his back. Why stand here and truckle to a sentiment, because, forsooth, somebody will accuse you of not having as much patriotism as some gentleman who talks about the soldiers? I believe that patriotism lies deeper than mere lip service, and I believe I can show more patriotism by being honest than I can by being thieving and covering it up by any words of praise. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If the extravagance set forth in this paper is true, it is a disgrace to the American people. But, they say, we want to suppress the transport service, and say other nations copy after us. That is not a compliment to a great nation of toilers like the American people. We are not a military people, and I pray God we shall never become one. We can only become a military people by such practices as are detailed in this article. And, gentlemen, we can not escape this conviction. History, experience, and judgment tell us that any country that fosters a military spirit and maintains a great military establishment lives always in the shadow of a Caesar.

I am opposed to the maintenance of such a spirit. I am opposed to the wanton expenditure of the people's money. This very day I called attention to the fact that the chief officer of the military department of this Government, responding to an inquiry of the cost of the military operations in the Philippine Islands, said to the House of Representatives that we had expended

\$48,000,000 of money in the last eighteen months, when any man who has taken the trouble to investigate knows that we have expended between one hundred and twenty-five and one hundred and thirty million dollars.

Here is where the money has gone. Here is where one hundred and twelve millions went to. It is in the transport service. It is in magnificent looking-glasses, the Smyrna rugs, and the solid mahogany furniture, where the officers in ambrosial ease "the primrose path of dalliance tread," while the soldier sits on his cot under the deck. There is where the money goes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

[Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. HULL. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8582) making appropriations for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and had come to no resolution thereon.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois calls up a privileged report.

Mr. CANNON. A conference report on the deficiency bill. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read the statement instead of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to omit the reading of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9279) making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3 and 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Office of Auditor for the War Department: For the purpose of restoring and repairing the worn-out and defaced rolls and vouchers in the Office of the Auditor for the War Department, \$2,944.40."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "For printing and binding for the War Department, namely, for publication of the Official Records of the War of the Rebellion by the Record and Pension Office, \$10,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

J. G. CANNON,
S. S. BARNEY,

RICE A. PIERCE,

Managers on the part of the House.

EUGENE HALE,

W. B. ALLISON,

F. M. COCKRELL,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement of the managers on the part of the House was read, as follows:

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9279) making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report, namely:

On amendment numbered 1: Appropriates \$2,944.40 for the purpose of restoring and repairing the worn-out and defaced rolls and vouchers in the office of the Auditor for the War Department.

On amendment numbered 2: Authorizes, as proposed by the Senate, the erection of public buildings on a tract of land recently acquired as a site for necessary buildings at Fort Dupont, Del., before the consent of the legislature of Delaware to the purchase has been given.

On amendments numbered 3 and 4: Inserts the title, "Bureau of Equipment," in the bill, as proposed by the House.

On amendment numbered 5: Appropriates \$7,200, as proposed by the Senate, for work at and general repairs of the Capitol.

On amendments numbered 6, 7, and 8: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, \$2,500 for engraving and printing the geological maps of the United States, and \$20,000 for gauging the streams and determining the water supply of the United States.

On amendments numbered 9, 10, and 11: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, \$500 for stationery and \$1,000 for contingent expenses for the Department of State.

On amendments numbered 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, \$35,000 to supply certain deficiencies in the appropriations for expenses of the Senate.

On amendment numbered 18: Appropriates \$10,000, as proposed by the Senate, for publication of the Official Records of the Rebellion by the Record and Pension Office of the War Department.

The bill as finally agreed upon appropriates \$1,543,724.40, being an increase of \$79,144.40 over the amount of the bill as passed by the House.

J. G. CANNON,

S. S. BARNEY,

RICE A. PIERCE,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. I move the adoption of the conference report.
Mr. McRAE. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois if it is not quite unusual to have a public-building bill in an urgent deficiency bill?

Mr. CANNON. There is no public-building bill there.

Mr. McRAE. There is an appropriation for the purchase of a site.

Mr. CANNON. My recollection is that there was a former appropriation for an improvement of the service in Delaware, for the construction, as I recollect it, of barracks for a fortification. The consent of the legislature of Delaware has not been given. This authorizes the construction before the consent is given, it being morally certain that it will be given, and being very urgently recommended. The Senate were clearly of the opinion, and the House conferees agreed, that from the standpoint of the demands of the service the provision ought to be made. It does not carry any money. The money had already been appropriated.

Mr. McRAE. It seemed to me that, in view of the fact that we have not yet considered the fortification bill, the item should have gone into that bill.

Mr. CANNON. I do not think this item belongs in the fortification bill, but it would go in the sundry civil bill.

Mr. McRAE. Well, the sundry civil bill, then.

Mr. CANNON. It was because of the urgency of the matter, the desirability if not the necessity of proceeding at once, as the conference committee were satisfied, that the Senate amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McRAE. I understood the gentleman to say that it related to some land necessary for a fortification.

Mr. CANNON. For the construction of buildings before the jurisdiction is formally ceded by the legislature of the State of Delaware.

Mr. McRAE. If the gentleman thinks it is necessary, I make no point on that; but it seemed to me that this was not the proper place for an item of that sort, on an urgent deficiency bill. Certainly it is not a deficiency.

Mr. CANNON. The House conferees were thoroughly satisfied, after investigation, that it was proper.

Mr. McRAE. But you are also thoroughly satisfied that it is not a deficiency.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, it is not a deficiency in the technical sense that an appropriation for the expenses of this House is a deficiency, yet it was a Senate amendment that we could not get rid of, if we had desired to do, by a point of order in the House. We can not in that way dispose of Senate amendments, and it was so manifestly proper for the reason indicated that the House conferees were unanimous in believing that it ought to be agreed to.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee how much money does this bill carry?

Mr. CANNON. Something over a million dollars. The Clerk can state the amount.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the total of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

One million five hundred and forty-three thousand seven hundred and twenty-four dollars and forty cents, being an increase of \$79,144.40 over the amount of the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Do I understand that the \$35,000 inserted under the head of the Senate is for extra salaries and extra offices created in the Senate?

Mr. CANNON. No; I do not so understand. It is for miscellaneous expenses to be paid out of their contingent fund. They, like us, have people engaged in very expensive investigations. We had to have about \$20,000 for our contingent fund, largely made necessary from some very expensive investigations that are going on, the transportation of witnesses over great distances, and large per diem and fees of officers, and so on.

Now, the Senate do not allow the House to do all that kind of thing. They have something of that kind on hand. But let that be as it may, I will say to my friend that for years, after being fought out to the bitter end, it has been conceded that touching the expenses of the Senate and House the coordinate branch, when the item is insisted upon, is expected to assent to the appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I thought that was the case, and that was the reason I made the suggestion at this time and drew the attention of the House to what I consider to be the extravagant expenditures of the Senate.

Mr. CANNON. Well, speaking respectfully, if I may under the rules, concerning the coordinate branch, I think they spend more money for their employees than we do, but they have no copyright on extravagance, to the exclusion of this House, as is agreed by members on each side and frequently referred to by members on that side.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. But the per capita expenses of the Senate are about four times the per capita expenses of the House, and I think there is unwarranted extravagance in carrying on the Senate.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. CANNON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

SARAH E. FORTIER.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 2020, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

BOARDING OF VESSELS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, March 23, 1900.

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 733) entitled "An act concerning the boarding of vessels."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, this request will be complied with, which will result in discharging the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries from the consideration of the bill.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill and resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 477. An act granting a pension to Levi C. Faught—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Senate concurrent resolution 36:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 4,500 copies of the work entitled The Louisiana Purchase, by the honorable Commissioner of the General Land Office of the United States, 1,500 copies for the use of the Senate and 3,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives—to the Committee on Printing.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. MILLER, for ten days, on account of important business. To Mr. GRAHAM, for one week, on account of important business. And then, on motion of Mr. HULL (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Attorney-General, transmitting vouchers constituting claims of L. B. Shephard, United States commissioner at St. Michael, Alaska—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, a recommendation with reference to deposit of company funds in United States depositories—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Upper Illinois and Lower Des Plaines rivers—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for pay of Military Academy—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. KNOX, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7091) relating to Hawaiian silver coinage and silver certificates, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 831); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4718) to regulate the collection and disbursement of moneys arising from leases made by the Seneca Nation of New York Indians, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 832); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 963) to designate Green Bay, Wis., a support of entry, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 833); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to

which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6554) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Carlton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 795); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4037) granting a pension to Mrs. Annie M. Churchward, widow of William F. Churchward, late private, Company H, One hundred and fifty-ninth New York Infantry, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 796); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8655) granting an increase of pension to Edgar H. Stevens, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 797); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 950) granting a pension to Sarah Ann Fletcher, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 798); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3186) granting a pension to Margaretha Lippert, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 799); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1977) granting an increase of pension to Levi Moser, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 800); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8801) granting an increase of pension to W. H. H. MacDonald, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 801); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4422) granting a pension to William H. Brookins, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 802); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9180) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel L. Colson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 803); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9419) granting a pension to Mrs. H. P. Cotter, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 804); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9163) granting a pension to Ferguson M. Burton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 805); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2200) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth W. Murphey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 806); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2943) granting an increase of pension to James J. Holland, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 807); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 755) granting a pension to Hannah R. Johnson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 808); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3125) granting a pension to Emily A. Larimer, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 809); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8632) to place upon the pension roll Louisa C. Germain, widow of Charles Germain, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 810); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2545) granting a pension to Nellie A. West, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 811); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the

bill of the Senate (S. 1600) granting an increase of pension to John T. Hayes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 812); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1787) granting an increase of pension to Joseph P. Pope, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 813); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 681) granting a pension to Julia D. Richardson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 814); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4789) granting a pension to Mary M. Young, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 815); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1271) granting a pension to Charles Williamson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 816); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 342) granting a pension to Eleanor McDevitt, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 817); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7230) granting a pension to Roxie B. Salter, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 818); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5978) for the relief of Amos Van Nausdile, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 819); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. COCHRANE of New York, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2830) granting an increase of pension to Caroline B. Bradford, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 820); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8992) to place on the pension roll the name of Margaret J. Kibble, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 821); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOFFECKER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3103) granting a pension to Seleder Burnham, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 822); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 752) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Comery, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 823); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRIGGS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3004) granting an increase of pension to James H. Stevens, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 824); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 359) granting an increase of pension to William M. Walker, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 825); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2162) granting a pension to Frances J. Manley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 826); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9751) granting a pension to David H. Drake, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 827); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HEDGE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1754) granting an increase of pension to Burton Packard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 828); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8559) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Margaret R. Clune, reported the same with amendment, ac-

companied by a report (No. 829); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEAVER, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7480) for the relief of the legal representatives of Tomlinson and Hartup & Co., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 830); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10001) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph T. Stout—Committee on Ways and Means discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 3696) for the relief of Mary R. Frost—Committee on Ways and Means discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 7192) to grant a pension to Patrick Doyle—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10070) granting a pension to W. E. Grubbs—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4899) granting a pension to Mrs. Ella Cotton Conrad—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 10097) to authorize the Atlantic and Gulf Short Line Railroad Company to build, construct, and maintain railway bridges across the Ocmulgee and Oconee rivers, within the boundary lines of Irwin, Wilcox, Telfair, and Montgomery counties, in the State of Georgia—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEVY: A bill (H. R. 10098) to transfer the Army transport service afloat from the War Department to the Navy Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 10099) fixing the charges upon parlor and other cars, and so forth—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 10100) to amend section 21 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFECKER: A bill (H. R. 10101) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to have prepared and issued a "Service medal of honor" to certain officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Union Army, Navy, and Marine Corps—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 10102) to reimburse naval volunteers—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KLEBERG: A bill (H. R. 10103) for the suppression of monopolies and corporations and associations who engage or offer to engage in interstate commerce in the restraint of trade and commerce between the several States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 10149) providing for commutation of transportation and subsistence of officers and enlisted men when honorably discharged from the service of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 10150) to provide for the construction of the Maryland and Delaware Free Ship Canal as a means of military and naval defense, and for commercial purposes—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 36) to print copies of the Statistical Abstract of the United States—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: A resolution (H. Res. 200) granting admission to clergymen of all denominations to all Army posts and quarters—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of New York: A resolution (H. Res. 201) calling upon the Secretary of War for information regarding Army transports—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 10104) to remove the record

of dishonorable discharge from the military record of Andrew M. Laughlin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARBER: A bill (H. R. 10105) to correct the military record of Patrick O'Connor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 10106) granting an increase of pension to Louann A. Perry, of Pueblo, Colo.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BREWER: A bill (H. R. 10107) granting an increase of pension to Philip Mooney—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 10108) for the relief of J. W. Godsey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKETT: A bill (H. R. 10109) granting a pension to Mary Ann O'Leary—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10110) for the relief of A. S. Cannon, late postmaster at Moscow, Tex.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 10111) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William H. Corless—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STANLEY W. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 10112) granting an increase of pension to Leona E. Benscoter—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 10113) for the relief of the estate of Octave La Branche, deceased, late of St. Charles Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 10114) for the relief of William W. Leake, of Florida—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 10115) for the relief of the heirs of James Madison Martin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10116) for the relief of the heirs of J. M. Robb—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILLET of New York: A bill (H. R. 10117) granting an increase of pension to William L. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 10118) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Flynn, of Mississippi—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also (for Mr. Fox), a bill (H. R. 10119) for the relief of Mrs. E. S. Smith, of Calhoun County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 10120) granting a pension to Susanah Pitts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LENTZ: A bill (H. R. 10121) to correct the military record of Frank D. Myers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10122) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Vankirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10123) granting an increase of pension to John Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10124) granting a pension to Richard B. Dunlap—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10125) granting a pension to Narcissa L. Brandon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 10126) granting a pension to Turner Holcomb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 10127) granting a pension to Nancy Whirley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10128) for the relief of Henry Lorback, of Waverly, Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 10129) to carry into effect the finding of the Court of Claims in behalf of Peter Targarona—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10130) to increase the pension of James Moss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 10131) to remove the charge of desertion against Philip R. Yates, late of Company F, Seventh Vermont Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 10132) granting a pension to Charles H. Wickham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIDGELY: A bill (H. R. 10133) granting a pension to John Carr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10134) to remove the charge of desertion standing against William Blundell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10135) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William H. Linton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10136) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Samuel Allen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10137) to remove charge of desertion against John C. Bogard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10138) to remove the charge of desertion against George C. Armstrong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10139) to remove charge of desertion against George W. Grigsby—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10140) to remove the charge of desertion against Hiram Lane—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10141) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Thomas W. Gallagher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 10142) for the relief of George Umbaugh, of Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10143) for the relief of the estate of James Fallin, deceased, late of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10144) for the relief of the legal representatives of Jonah Hood, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10145) for the relief of Joseph L. Verts, of Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10146) granting an increase of pension to James Willard, of Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 10147) granting a pension to Delia A. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 10148) to extend Letters Patent No. 183268, in favor of the inventor, Timothy L. Lynch, of Jersey City, N. J.—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. VANDIVER: A bill (H. R. 10151) to correct the military record of Zadock Phillips—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER: Petition of citizens of Cecil County, Md., against the passage of the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Dushane Post, No. 3, Department of Maryland, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home for disabled soldiers at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARNEY: Petition of M. G. Townsend Post, No. 105, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Wisconsin, in support of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL: Petitions of citizens of Montevista, Mancos, Ophir, and Dolores, Colo., against the passage of the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Congregational Church of Montevista, Colo., for the passage of a bill giving prohibition to Hawaii—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petitions of citizens of Walsenburg and Cimarron, Colo., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Antoinette A. Hawley, of Denver, Colo., to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENTON: Resolutions of Stephen Decatur Post, No. 142, and Eagle Post, No. 492, Department of Missouri, Grand Army of the Republic, in support of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Petition of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring the prompt passage of the shipping subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: Petition of T. B. Bradford and others, of Goldenridge, Me., to amend the present law in relation to the sale of oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Lyman Blair and other citizens of Greenville and Sherman Mills, Me., in favor of the Grout oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRENNER: Petition of Parmerlee-Horn Post, No. 623, Department of Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the passage of a bill to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Resolution of U. S. Grant Post, No. 340, Grand Army of the Republic, Cincinnati, Ohio, in favor of a bill locating a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: Petition of Todd Post, No. 15, of Columbus Junction, Iowa, and Robeson Post, No. 51, of Camden, N. J., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home for disabled soldiers at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Petition of Charles Moore Post, No. 725,

Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Illinois, indorsing the bill to establish a Branch Home for Disabled Soldiers at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Petition of citizens of Unionville, Mo., in favor of the Grout bill, taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of citizens of Kendall, Wis., asking for the passage of the anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., with reference to the bill for the encouragement of the American merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Boston Retail Grocers' Association, favoring the enactment of House bill No. 6246, known as the Brosius pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, expressing confidence in the wisdom of the Administration and of Congress in legislation relating to Puerto Rico—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Resolution of J. B. Wakefield Post, No. 172, of Long Lake, Minn., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Commercial Club of St. Paul, Minn., against the passage of a certain bill authorizing the manufacture and use of trade checks—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolutions of Colonel J. B. Clark Post, No. 162, of Allegheny, and Eli Hemphill Post, No. 135, of Tarentum, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, in support of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, praying for legislation to build up the merchant marine of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of Samuel Brown Post, No. 56, of Enfield, Conn., Grand Army of the Republic, urging the passage of House bill No. 7094, for the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Mississippi (for Mr. Fox): Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Mrs. E. S. Smith, of Calhoun County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Ann Flynn, of Mississippi—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: Resolutions of S. C. Armstrong Post, No. 51, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Virginia, in favor of House bill No. 7094, for the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Reedy Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Caroline County, Va., urging the enactment of a clause in the Hawaiian constitution forbidding the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors and a prohibition of gambling and the opium trade—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Reedy Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Caroline County, Va., praying for more stringent legislation against the sale of liquors in the Army canteens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KLEBERG: Petition of A. M. Barney Post, No. 67, of Brownsville, Tex., Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LESTER: Memorial of the Georgia Medical Association, asking that the Surgeon-General of the Army have the rank, pay, and allowances of a major-general—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONG: Resolution of Newton Post, No. 120, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, favoring the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home for disabled soldiers at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: Resolutions of Chicago Heights Post, No. 759, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Illinois, in favor of the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEEKISON: Petition of Joy Post, No. 152, of Pioneer, Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, urging the passage of House bill No. 7094, for the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Resolutions of Frank White Post, No. 490, Department of Indiana, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home for disabled soldiers at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Marcissa L. Brandon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: Petition of Peter Targarona, in the matter of the findings of the Court of Claims in his behalf—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NAPHEN: Resolution of the Chicago Federation of Labor, against the passage of the Tawney bill for the increase of tax on butterine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, for the considering of Puerto Rican legislation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Boston Retail Grocers' Association, approving House bill No. 6246, known as the Brosius pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of Senate amendments to House bill No. 8347, restoring the appropriations for the maintenance of the Hydrographic Office—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, requesting the passage of the shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. NEVILLE: Statement of Business Men's Association, J. T. Mallalieu, secretary, and cards showing business statistics; also statement of postmaster at Kearney, with evidence, in support of House bill No. 9129, to purchase site and erect a public building at Kearney, Nebr.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Resolution of J. R. Gordon Post, No. 281, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, urging the passage of House bill No. 7094, for the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS: Petition of citizens of Fairfield, Vt., to amend the present law in relation to the sale of oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Petition of citizens of Merrickville, N. Y., against the passage of the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petitions of citizens of Franklin, N. Y., and of citizens of Delaware County, N. Y., in favor of the bill to tax oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIXEY: Petition of J. S. Douglas, for the heirs of James H. Gaskins, deceased, of Fauquier County, Va., praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for the relief of the estate of James Fallin, deceased, late of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Joseph L. Verts, of Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of George Umbaugh, of Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTS: Resolutions of Abraham Lincoln Post, No. 11, of Boston, Mass., and General H. G. Berry Post, No. 40, Department of Massachusetts, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the passage of a bill to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: Resolutions of members of the bar of Ocala, Fla., in relation to redivision of the State of Florida as to its Federal judicial districts and providing for a term of the court at Ocala—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Resolution of the Texas Cattle Raisers' Association, for the continuation of Government distribution of blackleg vaccine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the Texas Cattle Raisers' Association, protesting against legislation placing a tax on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the Texas Cattle Raisers' Association, favoring the passage of the Kleberg House bill regulating railroad rates, and preventing discrimination—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas, requesting the passage of a bill permitting cattle to remain on cars in transit forty hours instead of twenty-eight hours, as now provided by law—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Resolutions of the Commercial Club of St. Paul, Minn., favoring Federal ownership of Government lands and the building of storage reservoirs by the Government—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Delia A. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THAYER: Resolutions of A. B. R. Sprague Post, No. 24, of Grafton, Mass., Grand Army of the Republic, indorsing the bill to establish a Branch Home for Disabled Soldiers at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petition of citizens of Centralia and Mayville, N. Y., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Fred E. Bonsteel and other druggists of Jamestown, Fredonia, and Dunkirk, N. Y., for the repeal of the stamp tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Gowanda, N. Y., urging the passage of the Lacey bill for the protection of wild birds and game—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Dunkirk, N. Y., urging the enactment of a clause in the Hawaiian constitution forbidding the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors and a prohibition of gambling and the opium trade—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. WISE: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Thomas Allen, late a private in Company L, Fourth Virginia Infantry, in late Spanish-American war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of the League of American Sportsmen, favoring the passage of House bills 6634 and 6062, for the preservation and protection of wild game and perpetuating the American buffalo—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Botanical Society of Pennsylvania, in favor of a national park being made of the Calaveras grove of sequoias, in the State of California—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, letter of H. L. Scott, favoring Government distribution of blackleg vaccine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Lawrence Keohane and Minerva J. Hartzman, of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the passage of House bill No. 4728, relating to leave of absence with pay to certain employees of the Government—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Chicago Federation of Labor, against sundry bills taxing oleomargarine and butterine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Cyrus D. Hottenstein, asking for relief—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ZENOR: Resolutions of Jeffersonville Post, No. 86, and Magnus Brucker Post, No. 234, Grand Army of the Republic, of Jeffersonville, Ind., in support of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, March 29, 1900.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. SCOTT, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

LEGATION BUILDING AT BANGKOK.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting a further dispatch from the minister of the United States at Bangkok, Siam, stating the reason why an appropriation of \$2,000 for repairing the legation premises and grounds at that place should be made.

Mr. HALE. That matter has already been acted upon, and I move that the communication and accompanying papers be printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

OLD COURT-HOUSE PROPERTY IN INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Supervising Architect, submitting an estimate of appropriation to pay rent for the remainder of the current fiscal year for the portion of the old court-house and post-office property formerly belonging to the United States in the city of Indianapolis, Ind., \$4,000; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

INSULAR TARIFF COLLECTIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 22d instant, the tariff schedules now in force and effect in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippine Islands, together with statements showing the amount of revenues collected from tariff duties in Cuba from January 1, 1899, to January 31, 1900, and in the Philippine Islands from date of military occupation to December 31, 1899, etc.

Mr. HALE. Let that communication be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, the communication, with the accompanying papers, will be printed. To what particular committee shall the communication be referred?

Mr. HALE. I suppose it should go to the Puerto Rican Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It relates to the tariff in the Philippine Islands and Puerto Rico, as well as Cuba and Guam.

Mr. HALE. Does the communication refer to the tariff duties in all of the different islands?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In all of the islands.

Mr. HALE. Then let it go to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That reference will be made, in the absence of objection.

AGES OF EMPLOYEES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 16th instant, certain information relative to the number of persons employed in the Navy Department and bureaus as clerks, messengers, etc., between certain ages, and the number now on the rolls who are permanently incapacitated, etc.; which was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

TRANSPORT SHIPS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of January 9, 1900, a letter from the Quartermaster-General United States Army, and accompanying statements, relative to the transport ships and other vessels purchased or chartered by the War Department since March 4, 1897, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

CLAIMS OF NEZ PERCE INDIANS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a decision in relation to the claims of certain Nez Perce Indians for compensation for services claimed to have been rendered by them as scouts, couriers, and messengers under Gen. O. O. Howard in 1877; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 733) concerning the boarding of vessels.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3207) approving a revision and adjustment of certain sales of Otee and Missouri lands in the States of Nebraska and Kansas.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the following bills:

A bill (H. R. 6627) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 9279) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 911) to amend section 1176 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 6627) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes; and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a petition of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Dunkirk, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in any post exchange, canteen, or transport, or upon any premises used for military purposes by the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DAVIS presented a memorial of the Commercial Club of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prevent the use of trade checks; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of St. Paul,